



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 209

1st Session

35th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, October 28, 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
Monday, October 28, 2024 — 1:00 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Speaker: Introduction of visitors.
Visitors introduced

Speaker: Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of Royal Canadian Legion's poppy campaign

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the first poppy ceremony in the poppy campaign, led by the Canadian Legion to honour the countless contributions and sacrifices of our veterans.

The tradition of the poppy began during the First World War when soldiers in the fields of Flanders, Belgium saw thousands of red poppies blooming amid the chaos. This inspired soldier and poet John McCrae to write his famous poem *In Flanders Fields*. The poppy became a symbol of remembrance worldwide. Rooted in the tradition since 1921, the poppy campaign continues each year thanks to the efforts of the Canadian Legion.

This year, the first poppy in Whitehorse was presented on October 25 at the Veterans Square cenotaph where Commissioner Adeline Webber received it, officially marking the start of the campaign. The ceremony included raising the poppy flag above the cenotaph in the Jim Smith Building, where it will fly until Remembrance Day. Locally, the Whitehorse Royal Canadian Legion Branch 254 supports this initiative, and we are grateful for their dedication to the veterans in our community.

When we purchase a poppy, our donations support veterans and their families, providing essential services like housing, medical care, and mental health support.

Each year, we wear the poppy over our hearts, keeping the memory of our veterans alive. This is a recognition of the contributions made by veterans and armed service members who have served and continue to serve our country.

While we often associate the poppy on Remembrance Day with the world wars, our people in uniform have been deployed globally for various missions, including counterterrorism, peacekeeping, and humanitarian aid. These are the individuals whom we honour, support, and recognize when we wear the poppy.

The beauty of the poppy campaign is that it involves everyone. People of all ages and backgrounds can wear a poppy, donate, or volunteer with the legion to help to distribute them. By participating, we not only remember those who served but also support those who still need us.

In this way, the poppy becomes a symbol of our gratitude and commitment to giving back to those who have sacrificed so much. As we see poppies in schools, stores, and workplaces, let us remember the campaign's purpose. I encourage Yukoners to participate, donate, and spread this message of remembrance and respect for our veterans. Wearing the poppy is a duty and a commitment to recognizing the courage and sacrifice of those who have served our country, individuals who risk everything to protect our freedoms and way of life.

On behalf of all Yukoners, I extend our sincerest gratitude to all our veterans and current service personnel for all that they have given and continue to give to our country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to everyone who has joined us here today. We will remember.

Applause

Mr. Istchenko: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to pay tribute to the first poppy. On the last Friday in October before Remembrance Day, millions of Canadians wear a poppy as a visual pledge to never forget those who sacrificed for our freedom. I would encourage everyone in the Yukon to show their recognition by proudly wearing this symbol of remembrance and taking a moment to reflect. Each November, poppies bloom on the lapels and collars of millions of Canadians.

The person who first introduced the poppy to Canada and the Commonwealth was Lieutenant-Colonel John McCrae of Guelph, Ontario. He was a Canadian medical officer during the First World War. John McCrae wrote the poem *In Flanders Fields* on a scrap of paper in May 1915 on the day following the death of a fellow soldier. The poem has since become a beautiful allegory that reminds us of the importance of Remembrance Day, and the poppy remains a symbol of remembrance.

The poppy continues to be worn each year during the remembrance period to honour Canada's fallen. The legion also encourages the wearing of a poppy for the funeral of a veteran and for any commemorative event honouring fallen veterans. It is not inappropriate to wear a poppy during other times to commemorate fallen veterans and it is an individual choice to do so, as long as it is worn appropriately.

Thanks to the millions of Canadians who wear the legion lapel poppy each November. The little red flower has never died and the memories of those who fell in battle remains strong. Today, we pay tribute to all the veterans and the Royal Canadian Legion as they launch their campaign this month and the numerous other activities they organize in the weeks leading up to Remembrance Day.

I would also like to thank many, many other Yukoners in our smaller communities. There is a legion in Dawson and there are Rangers and community members who get the poppies out. They got them out last Friday and we thank them.

So, as a proud member of the legion, I understand the work that is done this time of year. I can tell you that it sure is appreciated, so please wear a poppy. It is our duty to make sure that the actions of those who dedicated their lives and died for our safety, freedom, and independence are never forgotten.

Lest we forget.

Applause

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, I stand on behalf of the Yukon NDP in commemoration of the first poppy. Years ago when Canadian veterans were facing unnecessary challenges to accessing services, I had the very real privilege of spending time at the Whitehorse legion, listening and learning. The veterans I sat with didn't regret their service, but they had feelings and thoughts about what it meant to be home. They worried that it was easy for people to forget why Canada has the Canadian Armed Forces and that their role is to defend our country, protect our peace, and stand up for security around the world, and that could be misunderstood.

It is these CAF members who act as peacekeepers, neutral international troops who are sent to countries in turmoil to help reduce tensions and restore peace, and they do so at great risk and cost to themselves and their families. They shared that it was those experiences as peacekeepers that make them value everything around them at home, but they find it frustrating how often the privileges that we have are taken for granted. That is the crux of why we wear the poppy, isn't it? It is to remind us not to take the privileges that we have in Canada for granted. Tens of thousands of people have paid the cost for the democracy and freedom that we have and many people across the world live without the daily security that we have here.

Wearing a poppy reminds us all that there are people still living in war zones and that there are those here to help them. It reminds us of the people here in Canada, past and present, who have put their lives on the line for the benefits that we enjoy. It lets the families of soldiers know that we care about the sacrifices that they have had to make. It honours the veterans of the past and it shows respect for those serving in the present, and it fosters hope for the future.

So, when you see legion members and volunteers around town with poppies, stop and engage. Take a poppy. Donations are gratefully accepted but not required. The small act of wearing a poppy reminds us of the importance and the value of peace.

Lest we forget.

Applause

In recognition of Bat Week

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I rise to pay tribute to Bat Week, which runs from October 24 to October 31, 2024. Bat Week is an annual international celebration to raise awareness for bat conservation. Bats provide a variety of ecological goods and services, including insect control that contributes to the success of forestry and agriculture in Canada. The role of bats is especially important in environments like the primitive Yukon boreal forest where they play a critical role as the sole predator of nocturnal forest insects.

Bats are common summer residents of central and southern Yukon. They range as far north as the Ogilvie and Wernecke mountains north of Mayo and the Yukon River northwest of Dawson City.

The little brown bat, though endangered, is the Yukon's most common and widespread bat. Six other species have been documented in southern and southeastern Yukon, including northern myotis, the hoary bat, the silver-haired bat, and the eastern red bat, all assessed as endangered by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

Bat populations are sensitive to disturbances like disease and habitat loss. Addressing co-existence issues between people and bats is crucial to ensure their sustainability.

There are some actions that Yukoners can take to protect bats. Do not disturb roosting bats, especially in June and July when they are taking care of their pups. Help keep wetland and forest habitats in their natural condition so bats have a place to feed, sleep, and raise their young. When cutting down trees, leave large standing dead trees with loose bark because these provide valuable roosting sites. Consider installing a bat house to provide bats with a safe place to live and, as a bonus, you'll have fewer mosquitos in the area. When most active, one little brown bat can catch up to 600 mosquito-sized insects in one hour.

The Department of Environment continues to conduct research to learn more about bats in the Yukon to better inform conservation and management of endangered bats. Since 2004, the Department of Environment has operated an annual monitoring program for bats, and this June, supported by our wildlife viewing team, we reached our 10,000th capture, mark, and release of little brown bats in the Yukon.

The Department of Environment also supports schools and organizations with funding and resources to build and install bat houses in the communities. This important milestone highlights the dedication of staff, students, and volunteers for bat research in the Yukon, and their work allows us to track individual bat health over many years.

Mr. Speaker, it can truly be said that they are all passionate batmen and batwomen.

This Bat Week, I encourage all Yukoners to learn more about this important species, and, Mr. Speaker, this tribute is on behalf of the entire Legislative Assembly.

Applause

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Speaker: Under Tabling Returns and Documents, the Chair has for tabling the final report of the Yukon Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform.

Are there any further returns or documents for tabling?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling, pursuant to section 103 of the *Education Labour Relations Act*, the Yukon Teachers Labour Relations Board annual report.

I also have, pursuant to section 101 of the *Public Service Labour Relations Act*, for tabling the Yukon Public Service Labour Relations Board annual report.

Speaker: Are there any reports of committees?
Are there any petitions to be presented?
Are there any bills to be introduced?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the October 24, 2024 order of Committee of the Whole, I have for tabling a reprinted version of Bill No. 44, *Traffic Safety Act*. The reprinted version incorporates the amendments agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

Speaker: Are there any further bills to be introduced?
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 expresses condolences to those impacted by the devastating effects of Tropical Storm Trami in the Philippines.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to review the *Municipal Act*, which has not been reviewed since 2002.

Speaker: Is there a statement by a minister?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Extended producer responsibility

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, today I am providing an update on our government's efforts to support environmental sustainability through extended producer responsibility alongside our support for the City of Whitehorse's recycling efforts.

First, extended producer responsibility is a system that holds producers accountable for all the products and packaging they create. Ensuring that these items are managed responsibly at the end of their life cycle helps to reduce waste and protects our environment. This system shifts the cost of waste diversion from taxpayers to producers, reducing financial pressure on the municipalities and regional governments that provide recycling services.

Extended producer responsibility came into force this year, allowing us to build an accessible waste-diversion system that meets Yukoners' strong commitment to sustainability. To support extended producer responsibility, our government is working to ensure that our partners implement these programs by the end of 2025. Over the next 15 months, we will shift responsibility for managing non-refundable recyclables as well as a range of hazardous and special products to the producers of those materials.

Final stewardship plans are due to the Department of Environment this fall. Each plan will be reviewed to ensure that it meets service level expectations, recovery targets, and waste-diversion objectives. I encourage local governments and communities to participate in the upcoming producer-led

discussions that will provide opportunities to learn about how extended producer responsibility programs can best suit their needs.

Mr. Speaker, Yukoners care deeply about the environment. That is why our government is committed to protecting our lands and waters for years to come. In addition to extended producer responsibility, I want to highlight our strong support for curbside recycling in Whitehorse. We know that recycling is a crucial part of protecting the Yukon's natural environment. Once Raven ReCentre decided to stop accepting non-refundable recyclable materials, Whitehorse residents faced a gap in recycling options before extended producer responsibility regulations start in 2025. Given this, the Yukon government took action to ensure that recycling continues in the Yukon's largest municipality.

While recycling is a municipal responsibility, we appreciated the City of Whitehorse's concerns about the financial impacts of launching a new curbside recycling program on short notice. We felt it was appropriate to offer up to half the costs of launching a curbside recycling program for Whitehorse residents. Our funding offer of \$2.4 million will cover up to half the costs of the City of Whitehorse's new curbside collection program and the processing of the materials collected.

Meanwhile, the Government of Yukon will continue to collect recyclable materials from depots across the territory, ensuring that they are processed and shipped to southern markets. I congratulate the City of Whitehorse on the recent opening of a public drop-off for non-refundable recycling at their waste management facility in Whitehorse. This initiative is a significant step toward making recycling more accessible for our residents. The city's curbside recycling program, set to launch in early December, aims to make it easier for all households currently getting curbside waste pickup to recycle. The curbside recycling program provides an immediate solution for residents while we finalize stewardship plans and transition responsibility to producers. Working together, we can make choices to support a strong, sustainable Yukon for generations to come.

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, this ministerial statement from the Minister of Community Services raises many questions. To quote from the statement we just heard: "Extended producer responsibility came into force this year..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is news to Yukoners.

Considering that the same minister told this House in Committee on November 7, 2023 — quote: "We plan to continue diversion credits to bridge to extended producer responsibility, which is estimated to be coming in 2025."

He even doubled down on that assertion in today's ministerial statement when talking about the City of Whitehorse's new curbside recycling program — quote: "... Whitehorse residents faced a gap in recycling options before extended producer responsibility regulations start in 2025."

So, why did the minister inform Yukoners last year and in this ministerial statement that EPR is to be implemented in

2025 and then just say, in the same ministerial statement, that EPR is already in effect in the year 2024?

As my colleague brought up last week, this has thrown off some Yukon businesses that wondered why fees on motor oil, oil filters, other lubricants, and antifreeze were being charged as of July 1.

I will ask again the same questions that my colleague asked last week: How did the government notify Yukon businesses that EPR was coming into force? How will this Liberal government communicate details of EPR to Yukoners and businesses other than through often vague and contradictory ministerial statements? While the Highways and Public Works minister tried to deflect the responsibility to Interchange Recycling, the group tasked with collecting the EPR fees, this is a reminder that it's this Liberal government that brought in EPR.

How does the government plan to ensure that Yukoners and Yukon businesses know exactly what their recycling fees are being collected for and where the money is going?

As we have been mentioning for several years now, it seems like this Liberal government forgets about rural Yukon. How will EPR be implemented in the communities?

This Liberal government has reduced the number of transfer stations in rural Yukon, forcing rural Yukoners to drive hundreds of kilometres just to dispose of their garbage, and many rural Yukoners have noted that the minister's plan to close these transfer stations will increase greenhouse gas emissions as they drive to dispose of their garbage.

MLA Tredger: I'll start by thanking all the people who have worked very hard to improve waste management in the Yukon. I'm thinking of the years of work and advocacy by Raven ReCentre, the work of the Department of Environment to get EPR off the ground, and the work by many parties to create a curbside recycling program for Whitehorse.

Extended producer responsibility is intended to, among other things, reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. Creating new products is emissions-intensive, which is why waste reduction is a key part of the Yukon's climate action plan. From what we have heard, this piece of the plan is going well, and I want to give a big congratulations to everyone who is making that happen.

What I do want to critique is the broader plan and specifically the emissions-reduction target that has been chosen by the Liberals, because the success of individual programs like EPR is only meaningful in the context of the larger climate action plan.

The calls from the United Nations are very clear. To paraphrase their website, science shows clearly that, in order to preserve a livable planet, emissions need to be reduced by 45 percent by 2030 and reach net zero by 2050.

When the Liberals first brought in their climate change plan, they only set a goal of a 30-percent reduction in emissions by 2030. This fell short of what is needed for a livable planet, so the Yukon NDP forced the Liberals to change that plan so that our future generations have a hope of a livable planet, and now, the goal is 45 percent by 2030.

As an aside, the Yukon Party voted against that target.

But now the Liberals have chosen again to abandon the hope of a livable planet. Today, we will debate a proposed goal for mining emissions that falls short of the target that the UN says is required. The Liberals have proposed a target for reducing mining emissions by 45 percent by 2035 — that's five years later than the target for the rest of the Yukon. More importantly, it's five years later than what the scientific consensus has said is necessary to maintain a livable planet.

Why have the Liberals chosen a target that does not meet the minimum requirements for ensuring a livable planet? They have said it's because it's not practical. Sometimes, I think that they have forgotten that when we talk about climate change, we are talking about physical laws of nature. They can't explain to the climate that we tried really hard; please give us a few extra years. Our question can't be: Is this plan reasonable? It has to be: Is this plan enough for a livable future?

Trying to explain their way out of that truth just isn't going to work. It's like stepping off a cliff and trying to explain to gravity that you have a really good plan to build a bridge in five years and that it just wouldn't have been realistic to build it any sooner. It may be true, but if you step off a cliff without a bridge, it doesn't matter how good your excuses are; you are going to fall.

Last week, I told the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that unless he tables evidence that reducing 45 percent by 2035, instead of 2030, is enough to ensure a livable planet, the Yukon NDP will move an amendment to the *Clean Energy Act* to change the target to 2030, because according to scientific consensus, that is what is required to have a livable planet.

The Yukon NDP will not give up on the hope of a livable future. We will not write off the possibility of a livable planet for future generations. We will listen to the best available scientific evidence about what our climate targets should be, and that is what we will fight for.

The other parties have a choice: The Liberals can keep trying to argue with the laws of nature and the Yukon Party can keep ignoring climate change altogether or they can all change course and commit to a livable future for the planet.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Mr. Speaker, I will start off by saying that many of us have severe concerns about the state of the climate and want action on climate change. We have *Our Clean Future*, which is a plan that this government put in place. It is nation-leading and it has a reporting-back feature so that we actually log our progress.

EPR is something that has been in place in many places in the country since 2017. We are again lagging the nation on this very important program, and I will say that the members opposite in the Official Opposition again sow confusion. The fact is that this House passed the EPR legislation and it went into play. Now we are implementing it and it will be implemented by 2025. There is no confusion here except in the opposition members' minds, and they are just continually going about it — and it was embarrassing last week when the Member for Kluane stood up and started attacking the government for

something that an industry organization put in place. I know that was embarrassing for them and they are trying to leverage this again, but it had nothing to do with this government; it had to do with a professional organization doing the right thing and putting a fee to its members on certain oil products. That is an industry-led thing — obviously a very progressive industry group — and I applaud their efforts. I think that the Government of Yukon and the citizens of Yukon will get on board the EPR system next year. My good colleague the Minister of Environment is actually spearheading that work.

So, I want to thank the members of the opposition for the opportunity to talk about our commitment to sustainable waste management and environmental stewardship in the House. The recent curbside recycling initiative launched by Whitehorse is an important milestone for our community. We congratulate the city on this significant step.

While recycling and waste-collection services have traditionally been handled by municipalities, our government recognizes the city's concerns over financial challenges. That's why we have provided funding to support half the costs for the new curbside recycling program as well as for processing collected materials. This funding, in place until the implementation of the extended producer responsibility regulations in 2025, helps make recycling more accessible to residents, extending the life of the landfill and promoting cost-savings as well as reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We are also well on track to implement extended producer responsibility across the territory by 2025, as laid out in *Our Clean Future*. That's the nation-leading climate action plan that our government penned. It's important that producers manage the waste that their products generate, ensuring that recycling is not only accessible to Yukoners but also driven by industry accountability.

Waste reduction must start from the moment the product is created, continue through its use, and follow through to the recycling or disposal, which is why extended producer responsibility is so critical. Through this program, we can expect to see less waste at the source, especially plastics, which aligns with Canada's national objectives on zero plastic waste. Working with federal and provincial partners on these collective solutions helps us to implement practices that support sustainable communities and resilient environments. Building a sustainable future requires a comprehensive approach that considers all environmental aspects from waste reduction to renewable energy.

I have spoken about the urgent need to act on climate change and the responsibility that we all share to do our part. As Minister of Community Services, I think daily about the costs of climate change. Front of mind is, of course, fires and floods, so these efforts that I'm talking about today will help bring about a better future.

Speaker: This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Public Accounts

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, with last week's presentation of the 2023-24 Public Accounts, Yukoners have been given a glimpse into the dire state of our public finances. Despite forecasting an \$80-million surplus in the budget last year, the Liberals ended up running a deficit. With growth in spending increasing dramatically faster than growth in revenues, it should come as no surprise to anyone that the government's debt has skyrocketed. In just one year, the Yukon Liberals managed to add over \$140 million in new debt.

Why are the Yukon Liberals driving the Yukon into the red?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the most recent update on borrowing was published in the 2023-24 Public Accounts, but what the member opposite is blurring between is long-term debt that we were saddled with by the Yukon Party and short-term lines of credit. When it comes to the long-term loans that this government has on its books right now, that's at \$215 million, which is \$40 million less than the apex of Yukon Party loans and grant borrowing, which was in 2011-12 and was over a quarter of a billion dollars.

I think the significant difference between what you're seeing with the fiscal responsibility that we're showing right now is short-term methods to make sure that we don't saddle with long-term debt, and that's the difference between the over \$5 million a year in annual interest that we still have to pay because of Yukon Party borrowing and the fiscal responsibility that continues to get us an AA- S&P rating when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that, in just one year, the Liberals have managed to add over \$140 million in new debt.

The Public Accounts include a number of graphs that assess the fiscal health of our public finances. Almost each and every one of them is headed in the wrong direction, but a few stand out as being particularly concerning. For instance, for the first time in modern history, the Yukon has a negative net debt per capita. This means that, for every single Yukon resident — every man, woman, and child — there is a net debt of about \$4,300.

So, Mr. Speaker, why is the Yukon Liberal government saddling Yukoners with this net debt?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, what the member opposite will not say is the fact that we're talking about short-term debt. With our FAA, lines of credit have to go back to zero. This is not years and years and years — like the Yukon Party saddling future generations of Yukoners with debt to the tune of over \$5 million each year since they took out loans decades ago, which will come to maturity in 2040, and not one cent of that money paid off — all just interest.

So, again, when we're talking about the short-term liabilities that are on the books right now and that are accounted through the Public Accounts, we believe that it's important to continuously invest and be conscientious to avoid the need for significant long-term borrowing. To date, we have done that.

We have dealt with environmental issues, we have dealt with mining issues, and we have dealt with many issues in health and social services without burdening long-term costs, unless they are absolutely necessary. So, again, I will not take lessons from the members opposite when it comes to borrowing, especially when, every year, we're still paying off the interest and no principal on the borrowing that the Yukon Party did back in 2011-12 when we apexed at a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of loans that the Yukon Party had no intention of paying off.

Mr. Dixon: It's also worth remembering that when the Liberals took office in 2016, the Yukon had strong financials and hundreds of millions of dollars in net financial assets. In fact, in 2016, we had over \$330 million in net financial assets. Now, in less than eight years, we've seen a swing of almost half a billion dollars in the wrong direction. This Liberal government is marching us straight into the poorhouse. What's even scarier is that they aren't even finished; they have said clearly that they want to increase the debt cap even further and borrow even more.

My question is this: How much debt will be attributable to each Yukon resident before the Liberals finally call it quits?

Hon. Mr. Silver: So, again, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that net financial debt reflects the differences between the government's total financial assets and its liabilities, which include long-term obligations such as environmental remediation and the retirement of government assets at the end of their useful life. It does not represent how much the government has borrowed or needed to borrow — for example, when I talk about the \$5 million-plus — and I'll get more information on that — that the Yukon Party has decided that is going to be paid out every year until 2040 in interest alone — so, completely two different things.

Now, when it comes to the increase in net financial debt, that's mainly a result of the Yukon government's proactive approach to addressing environmental liabilities in the territory. When we take a look at this, in March 31, 2024, we were aware of 114 sites where we were obligated to incur remediation costs. That is us planning now and showing on the books that we are accountable for the environmental degradation that we see to date and currently — making sure that we're putting it on our books in a financially responsible way, including major drivers like \$70 million for the Minto mine, which reflects the remaining liability for anticipated reclamation and closure activity. This is financial responsible. Again, this isn't borrowing; this is net financial debt — two different conversations that the members opposite would have you confuse.

Question re: Budget estimates and spending

Mr. Cathers: Mr. Speaker, it's not hard to understand how we ended up here.

Last year, the Liberals increased government spending by 12.3 percent. During that same time, revenues increased by 4.9 percent. For most households or business owners, if their revenues increased by 4.9 percent, they would manage to live

within their means. But this Liberal government keeps spending money that it doesn't have.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question is simple: Do the Liberals actually think it's sustainable to grow spending by over 12 percent while revenues grow at 4.9 percent?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, I will just say to the member opposite that he can't have it both ways. He can't keep on telling us to stop spending and then to spend more — and then to spend more and then to stop spending. It depends on the topic — the member opposite will flip-flop back and forth between whether or not the government is not spending enough or spending too much.

With the Public Accounts, again, we are talking about the difference between the second supplementary last year, where we identified our updates to that budget, and now we are talking about \$44 million more of a variance of the surplus from the second supplementaries for 2023-24. That includes increased expenses in the area of natural resources to identify environmental liabilities. I guess the members opposite would say that we shouldn't spend on that.

It also involves spending to support the delivery of health care services. Again, does the member opposite, when we are taking these new numbers and showing them, saying that we shouldn't be spending money on our hospitals and on our corporation?

The other one is the increased funding related to a new collective bargaining agreement between the Yukon government and the employees union. Does he want us to take that money back?

Mr. Cathers: As the minister should know, we want the government to spend on the priorities of Yukoners. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' increasing spending across the board — much faster than revenues are growing — is not a new problem. This is a trend of their entire time in office. They have been ballooning spending far more than revenues have been growing every single year, so it comes as no surprise that the result is that the government is running out of money.

Mr. Speaker, what did the Liberals expect would happen after they spent more money than they had coming in year after year after year?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Mr. Speaker, when the Yukon Party saddled Yukon taxpayers with more than \$5 million of interest payments every single year for 40 years, without any obligation or desire to pay back the principal, that is bad financing.

What we are seeing right now is a government that has gone through a pandemic and provided money for businesses. We're seeing a government that survived the pandemic — in those very troubling times — better off than most jurisdictions in Canada when it comes to where we are comparatively — a little bit of perspective is an interesting thing that the Yukon Party doesn't want you to hear about. We saw inflation; we saw this coming to Yukoners in that time as well.

Again, we have had extraordinary times. We have seen increases in floods and fires. We have seen environmental liabilities increase, including Minto and now Eagle Gold as well. But yet the members opposite will still have you think that

their approach to borrowing — borrowing — long-term debt, a quarter of a billion dollars, with no desire to pay off the principal, is a better government than what we are doing right now, which is very conscientiously avoiding the need for significant long-term borrowing to date, as we have held that Yukoners should not be burdened by long-term costs — unless it is absolutely necessary. The only borrowing we have undertaken has been to address the unforeseen and urgent pressures, and they are on a short-term basis.

Mr. Cathers: Well, that is very imaginative and revisionist history by the minister. The single biggest expense line for this Liberal government is personnel. According to the Public Accounts, the Liberals have grown expenditures on personnel to a new record of \$786 million. In March 2017, that line was just over \$560 million. That means that, in just seven years, they grew the amount spent on personnel by a whopping 40 percent.

Since this is far more than the increase in our revenues, my question for the Premier is simple. Does he think that the Liberals' spending pattern is sustainable, and if he agrees that it isn't, why do they keep spending beyond our means?

Hon. Mr. Silver: What I just heard from the member opposite is: Cut back on spending on health care. What I heard from the member opposite right now is: Stop spending money on teachers. What I just heard from the member opposite is: Go back to a previous government where we would saddle current Yukoners with long-term debt. I would say no, unless it is absolutely necessary.

When we are responding to environmental emergencies, such as floods and fires, or meeting the rising health care needs, we believe in supporting our communities in times of crises.

Again, the members opposite will not tell you which one of those crises dollars that they would have us not spend. These are essential investments, Mr. Speaker. They can't have it both ways. They are made to provide relief and recovery resources that are urgently needed. We have managed almost entirely through the short-term borrowing — short-term borrowing or borrowing in less than 365 days — is borrowing that helps to ensure the efficient use of the consolidated revenue fund by providing bridge funding — bridge financing — between when payments are made for operational purposes and projects and when those recoveries are then received. This is short-term, less than a year, borrowing; otherwise, it turns into long-term borrowing.

That is the step that the Yukon Party just skipped over. Instead, they just rushed to grants and loans with no desire to pay off the principal and to make sure that debt wasn't passed on to future generations. That is a legacy that should be shameful for the members opposite.

Question re: Whistle Bend propane system

MLA Tredger: On Wednesday of last week, I asked about the emergency response to a propane leak at Whistle Bend Place in January. The minister said that he couldn't answer until he had been briefed. Now that his government has issued another statement, it seems safe to say that has happened, so I'll ask some more questions.

A January 25 press release stated that — quote: "This incident has demonstrated the effectiveness of emergency response protocols..."

In hospital management, a code brown means a hazardous spill or leak. We know from an access to information request that as much as 500 litres of flammable propane was leaked. Those same documents include a handwritten note that says, "Code brown, why not followed?" The ATIPP also repeatedly refers to the incident as "a major release of a hazardous substance".

Can the minister explain why the protocol for a code brown was not followed on January 19 at Whistle Bend continuing care?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for the question. As indicated, on January 19, 2024, a propane leak was detected by staff at Whistle Bend Place. Security alerted the Whitehorse Fire Department, who attended immediately and shut off the propane system. Shortly after, Whistle Bend Place staff were sent an e-mail outlining what happened, what the response was, and what to do if they experience any of the symptoms of propane exposure.

On January 23, residents and families were informed about a propane leak, with details of the incident, investigation, and support measures. They were reassured that residents were being monitored for propane exposure and that no health issues have been reported since then. On January 25, the Yukon government issued a press release — a news release — informing the public and media of this incident and answered many of the questions that the YEU and the Yukon NDP put to us.

Our government has been working with experts at Superior Propane, who repaired the leak and confirmed that there were no further leaks once the system resumed. We have also reviewed our safety and security procedures following the incident. Mr. Speaker, we also immediately reported the incident to the Yukon Workers' Safety and Compensation Board. The departments of Highways and Public Works, Health and Social Services, and the Public Service Commission have been in ongoing communication with the Yukon Employees' Union to address concerns that they have raised.

We gave the YEU a copy of the Associated Engineering report that presents the findings and recommendations following an in-depth assessment of propane infrastructure as well as the after-action —

Speaker: Order, please.

MLA Tredger: I am glad the minister mentioned the review, because when I asked about it last week, the minister didn't have answers. I'm hoping that, by coming back today, we will be able to get some reassurance for the residents and workers who remain worried about the safety of the facility.

As he mentioned, documents show that an after-action review was conducted. That review made four recommendations for action, but those actions have been redacted from the copy that was released through the ATIPP. After the Yukon NDP questioned the Liberals on this issue last week, the Liberals sent an e-mail to the media essentially saying that we should trust them to take care of it, but the

workers at Whistle Bend Place feel differently. They still don't know what the after-action review recommendations were or if they were followed.

Can the minister tell Yukoners — all Yukoners — what those four recommended actions were and if they have been completed?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, thank you for the question from the member opposite. The Yukon government retained a third-party contractor, Associated Engineering, to conduct an in-depth assessment of the propane and infrastructure management at Whistle Bend Place. The report was received by Highways and Public Works in September 2024, which included seven recommendations for improvements.

The department has accepted the recommendations and is currently implementing them. Highways and Public Works confirms that the propane system at Whistle Bend Place is in good condition and receives regular attention from the propane fuel supplier during fill-ups.

Highways and Public Works relies on local engineers to design all systems in conformance with all applicable codes and standards. The current propane system is code-conformant to a specific set of standards, guidelines, and best practices. The propane system's maintenance practices were in place with recommendations to update our practices with available technology and new practices, which the department will be undertaking.

Association Engineering has identified modifications that would better safeguard against future leaks causing that level of disruption. Highways and Public Works will be tendering for the design of these modifications in spring 2025 to meet E2 regulatory requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the E2 regulatory requirements are commonly applicable to larger commercial propane storage facilities at refineries.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to further response.

MLA Tredger: I appreciate the summary from the minister, but workers and residents are concerned about their ongoing safety on-site. They recognize how close this came to being catastrophic. The reviews, as the minister mentioned, flagged significant concerns and gaps in the emergency response, and it was clear that this situation could have been much worse.

As stated by the director of Strategic Operations in the ATIPP documents — quote: "... we narrowly averted a more serious situation..."

Yukoners have the right to know what happened and what has been done to prevent it from happening again in detail and not just in summary. I asked last week and I'll ask again: Will the minister commit to making the reports from all of the investigations public by tabling them in the Assembly?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, of course, Highways and Public Works — and the Yukon government in general — takes the safety of all Yukoners very seriously and the safety of all buildings that we are responsible for managing.

Highways and Public Works Property Management division has a current design standard developed by a local consultant for use in all propane installations. The work being done to modify the Whistle Bend Place system in line with E2 will be incorporated into Property Management design standards moving forward.

Additional work to comply with E2, *Environmental Emergency Regulations*, at other locations is underway to ensure that an emergency response plan is in place that meets the E2 standards, with all required reporting back to federal government to be complete. Other Yukon government buildings will be prioritized to ensure that they are meeting these safety requirements.

Actioning the recommendations includes changes to design that will be completed this winter, with execution of the work to be completed this coming spring.

Mr. Speaker, in the interim, Highways and Public Works is working collaboratively with the Department of Health and Social Services to support the creation of a robust emergency response plan for responding to a potential propane-related incident, which will be functionally tested on a regular basis, similar to a fire drill.

In addition, Yukon government is reviewing its practices and procedures to ensure there is continuous improvement.

Question re: Poverty and homelessness

Ms. Blake: Last week, we heard tributes in recognition of Poverty and Homelessness Accountability Week. More than a year has passed since this government announced a commitment to immediately end no-cause eviction, but the legislation to enable it has yet to be finalized.

When will this government fulfill their commitment to put no-cause evictions into legislation?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I will certainly endeavour to get a precise answer to the member opposite. This is a very important issue to us, and I will certainly get back to the member opposite.

Ms. Blake: Food Banks Canada's 2024 report card has done a lot of the work to research what the Yukon government could do to address poverty and homelessness.

The report card provides four policy recommendations. One recommendation is to use inflation rates to index the Yukon supplementary allowance for people with disabilities who receive social assistance. That policy recommendation also includes providing additional funding in recognition of the recent surge in food and shelter places and the likelihood that inflation will remain elevated in northern Canada for the foreseeable future.

Will this government commit to increasing social assistance rates for people with disabilities?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: It may be me today — and I apologize if that's the case — but I'm having a difficult time hearing the questions from the member opposite. I believe what she's asking about is support services — social assistance and others — for Yukoners.

We have recognized that some Yukoners, of course, are facing financial challenges in meeting their core needs, such as food and shelter, and our government, along with community

partners, have programs and services available to help to alleviate poverty. We continue to explore ways to support Yukoners most affected by rising inflation. Our government started engagement on Yukon's social assistance rates late in the summer of 2023 with clients who are on social assistance, and surveys were completed this summer, in August 2024, and a report is currently being developed.

Reviewing Yukon's social assistance rates is part of our work to address recommendations in the *Putting People First* report related to closing the gaps for lower income Yukoners.

I certainly want to thank many of our community partners for their commitment to helping in alleviating poverty. I do think the week — as we recognized last week — is incredibly important to bring this serious issue to the attention of all Yukoners — which I don't think is always on the top of their list, but it's important that they know.

Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Blake: The Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition issued a press release on October 18 calling on all levels of government to prioritize accountability. Experts like YAPC and Food Banks Canada provided tangible, measurable ways to work on issues like affordable housing, access to basic services, and increased support for food programs.

One recommendation that can create substantial positive outcomes across the board is to use inflation rates to index funding to programs, NGOs, and individuals. Will this government commit to using inflation rates to index funding to organizations and programs that serve communities experiencing homelessness and poverty?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the community leaders for their work last week in bringing many of these important issues to light to all Yukoners as well as to the Yukon government.

There were a number of things touched on. I think it's important to note that there are many initiatives that are underway, whether it's the unprecedented investment into affordable housing — we have not seen anything like this at any point — whether it's in our communities — whether it's Watson Lake or Dawson City or it's here in Whitehorse. The relationship with these community leaders is incredibly, incredibly important.

I know that we continue to fund a number of the groups who were just mentioned, and the points that were made last week — I want to give our folks — both the Yukon Housing Corporation and Health and Social Services — time to take a look at the recommendations. I know that we have seen the CPI — consumer price index — moving at a much slower rate than even the national average right now.

Again, taking a look at what those inflationary numbers are, in many cases, we have increased some of those agreements much more than that on an annual basis. We will take a look — we know we're in discussion with a lot of those groups, and we want to thank them for all the work.

Question re: **École Whitehorse Elementary School replacement**

Mr. Kent: So, last week, the Takhini Neighbourhood Association posted their notes from a meeting that they had with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Community Services about the location of the new École Whitehorse Elementary School. In their notes, they point out that the minister was not able to provide any clear, formal rationale as to why the government thinks that the Takhini location is the only one that they will consider. This is particularly confusing when we consider that, in September, the minister announced that the government was launching a process to engage the school community to identify new locations for a downtown school.

So, how does the minister reconcile the fact that she has launched a public, open process to identify new school locations downtown but that no such process was used for choosing the location in Takhini?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to speak about important infrastructure that our government is investing in. I am certainly happy to talk a bit about the meetings that I have had recently with partners, which included the Takhini Neighbourhood Association as well as Softball Yukon and Sport Yukon. We are working, of course, on some of the follow-ups to those meetings. There was well-received feedback at those meetings. I am working right now on replies and follow-ups for the various groups. They certainly were able to articulate to us what their priorities were.

Going back to the site selection, there were a number of factors that helped us make the decision that we did. The selected location on the site was the highest scoring on our consultant's assessment report — having a low impact on the Takhini Elementary School as it does not encroach on the school's space, protects existing programming, and provides them with a new soccer field. There are lots of other factors here that I will get to in the other questions.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister was about the double standard that exists in the processes between choosing a location for a school downtown and the location for the new École Whitehorse Elementary School in Takhini.

So, here's what the Takhini Neighbourhood Association said in their notes following their meeting with the ministers — and I quote: "The Ministers reiterated their position that they consider Takhini the only option available for Whitehorse Elementary School, but did not provide any formal rationale."

The ministers told us that other locations would have required lengthy rezoning processes; however, we now know that the Takhini site has a need for rezoning, changes to the official community plan, and other municipal planning requirements.

So, can the minister tell us what the formal rationale is for choosing this location in Takhini for the replacement of Whitehorse Elementary?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, going back to some of the factors in choosing the site: having a lower impact on traffic on Range Road by having access to the new school located on

University Drive; provides appropriate queuing space; being closer to the biomass facility at the Whitehorse Correctional Centre across the road for potential connection that will contribute with *Our Clean Future* goals; required smaller ground upgrades, which saves costs due to the location being outside of the poor drainage and flood-prone treed area on the lot; proximity to the existing municipal services; location outside of the treed area also allows for more of the healthy trees on-site to be kept; having staging and construction across the lot from the Takhini school will mitigate the impacts to that school while the new school is being built.

As I've stated before speaking about this important project, the next phase of the project involves several critical assessments, including traffic and environmental site review. Following completion of these assessments, we'll then move into the conceptual design phase, working on the responses to the Takhini Neighbourhood Association as well.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there was no engagement with stakeholders prior to choosing this location in Takhini. Earlier this Sitting, we called on the Liberal government to hold off on tendering this project until after the next election. In response, the Liberals issued a statement saying that it would be irresponsible to hold off tendering this project, and they refused to do so.

Since the Liberals have said it would be irresponsible to hold off on tendering this project until after the next election, can the minister tell us when this project will be tendered for construction?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, we've moved into the next phase of the planning, and that includes a substantial amount of work. A lot of the follow-ups that we have with the Takhini Neighbourhood Association include things like the traffic study that is underway, and other aspects of the project had some really good feedback recently from the project advisory committee talking about the excitement for planning such a new facility — also good feedback from the school council, which is very excited about the potential of this new school.

We are moving things forward. I think that we had some really good meetings last week. We definitely have some important follow-ups, and I am looking forward to having more discussions and working on mitigating some of the issues that folks have with the school. Mostly, I'm looking forward to building a new educational infrastructure that will meet the needs of students for generations to come.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Speaker: Introduction of visitors outside of the usual proceedings.

Visitors introduced

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

Chair: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

Bill No. 40: *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*.

Is there any further general debate?

MLA Tredger: Madam Chair, I will start by thanking all of the officials for being here again and all of the ones with me on the phone. I know that it's a lot of work to answer all of the questions and to have gotten the bill to this stage, so thank you.

When we left off last week, I had told the minister that we are committed to what the UN says is required for a livable planet, which is a 45-percent reduction by 2030 as opposed to the 45 percent required in 2035, which is what is in this bill. He talked about his experience as a climate scientist, so I said that if he can table evidence showing that a 45-percent reduction by 2035 would be enough for a livable planet, that would be great; we would really like to see that. Today, he hasn't tabled anything yet, but I'm going to give him a chance now to speak to that.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I'm going to try to describe in a few minutes what I think is more like — well, it's a very long conversation about what this science looks like.

First of all, what the *UN Framework Convention on Climate Change* and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change say — they are talking about a livable planet for all. So, let's please not confuse a livable planet — because what some people will hear is that it means that if we don't hold it at 1.5 degrees, we're going to end up with a place where people can't live. First of all, one of the ways to understand it is that, if I

think about the Yukon and I think about Florida, there is about 15 degrees of average temperature difference between here and Florida, and people live all the way between here and Florida and they will continue to do so. So, that's not what's happening, and it's not really about that temperature difference that's happening; it's more about the change in temperature. But even if I think about today here in the Yukon and I look at what the temperature was this morning and where we're getting to when the sun is out in the afternoon, we can get 10 degrees of shift easily in a day. So, it's not even about the change; it's about the rate of change, and it's about that rate of change to the whole of the system.

What it does is that it puts a lot of pressure — especially around things like water, food production, biodiversity, and extreme events. Those are the four big things. When the science talks about it, people are using these things like they are precise numbers — this 1.5 degrees. On average, I think the latest numbers that I have seen show that we have increased globally by 1.1 degrees already.

But the problem with the climate isn't that it stops on a dime. That's not how it works.

The risks that we are facing now — even if tomorrow we stopped producing any emissions so that all emissions stopped tomorrow, we would still have decades to a century of impacts on our terrestrial system and we would still have centuries to millennia of impacts on our ocean systems.

So, what's being conveyed in this concise statement by the member opposite is this notion that it's an exact number — it is not — and a notion that on one side it is all going to be good and on the other side it will be unlivable. That is not correct either.

But it is correct that this is very serious and that there is an imperative. The scientists — when they were working through this about how to try to relay that type of information so that the public could consume it and understand it — really want to share that notion of how critical this is. I think that we need to understand that it is not an exact line.

It's sort of like saying — I was trying to think of things where we all can intrinsically understand — and I thought about when kids learn to read. That's at age 6 — or age 7, if you're like me, because I was a little bit late. But it could be eight or it could be four. So, we say that it's around age 6 to age 7, but it really is pretty variable.

So, this whole notion of where we are and what the impacts are for our planet — we understand that the impacts are serious and we need ambitious targets. This is what the United Nations framework was all about. The idea was that we needed to recognize a problem. We need to set lofty and specific goals. We need to put the onus on us — meaning the developed countries — to lead the way. We need to invest in climate change activities and support the rest of the world. We need to keep looking at the problem and making sure that we are working to achieve these outcomes and these changes.

It is not so specific as the member opposite says, but I do agree with them that it is incredibly important.

I will just stop there and am happy to answer further questions.

MLA Tredger: I do understand, and I think that I have been fair in my summary of what the minister said last time. He was saying that it is an estimate. I do understand that it's not that, when the clock strikes midnight on January 1, if we haven't reached 45 percent, the world will collapse into the ocean. I understand that we are talking about a threshold and we are talking about best estimates.

That said, the minister has not given me any other estimates to work with. He has not tabled any evidence that suggests that a best estimate would actually be 2035 as an adequate time to reduce our emissions. So, I am going to continue to believe the best estimates provided by the UN and by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change until the minister provides something else. I am going to believe them when they say that we have to reduce our emissions by 45 percent in 2030, knowing that maybe it is 31 or 29 or 46 or 44. I am going to believe that they said that because they mean it and not because they are trying to emphasize a different point.

So, my party is going to move the amendment to this bill when we get to line-by-line debate, changing the target for reducing by 45 percent to 2030, because we are committed to a livable planet.

Before I conclude my remarks and turn the floor over to my colleague, I do have to address the minister's statement that when I say a "livable planet", I am suggesting that we talk about a livable planet for all people. I am actually suggesting that we consider what would be a livable planet for all people. The idea that it is not a relevant number because we would be fine but people would die across the world is pretty horrifying and not something that I would have expected to hear in this Chamber, to be perfectly honest.

So, yes, when I say "livable planet", I know that we have a lot of privilege in where we are.

I know that some people will be okay, and I know those will largely be people in countries like Canada who have a lot of privilege, a lot of money, and a lot of resources. I am still talking about it anyway. I think that we should still think it's a pretty important goal.

I will conclude my remarks there, and I look forward to further debate in line-by-line debate.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I will agree with the member opposite that the more devastating impacts with respect to climate change are happening in other parts of the planet. For example, we hear often in this Assembly and in our western media about the war happening in Ukraine and the war happening in Israel and the Gaza Strip and Palestine, but we don't hear about, for example, the conflict happening in Sudan, but I know that conflict is exacerbated by food insecurity, by the lack of food, which has come about because of severe weather events, which we believe are related to climate change.

The outcome of that is that you have 70 percent of their health care system collapsing, and we have a huge number of displaced people moving into another country, the neighbouring country Chad, which is an incredibly poor country and doesn't have the means to supply food. Those are the kinds of impacts that I think are happening. They are not just caused by climate change. There is conflict involved as

well, but they are certainly exacerbated by it. Of course, we need to work toward that.

I think that this is incredibly important, so I don't disagree with the member opposite about the importance of this. What I am trying to help Yukoners to understand is that it is not a precise line. I think that the thing that we should work toward is how we are going to get the best ambitious and serious reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in order to make this transition away from our current energy system, which is so dependent on fossil fuels. So, what is the right course of action to get us that best outcome? That is what I will argue for.

Mr. Kent: I would just like to quickly welcome the officials back to the Chamber this afternoon, Mr. Moore and Mr. Andre, who are here to support the minister during Committee of the Whole.

I just have some follow-up questions from the last time we were up, and I just wanted to dig in a little bit more on one topic that is in *Our Clean Future* with respect to zero-emission vehicles.

The first one is with — last time that we were here, the minister I believe committed to get some costs back to us on the costs of renewable diesel versus conventional diesel — I think that the example he was using was in Vancouver. So, I'm just curious if the minister has that information.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The department did go off and try to do some of this investigation, so there are a few things that I want to put as caveats around these numbers. The first one is that it really matters how much fuel you are bringing in. So, I'm going to give two examples: if we bring in a million litres of renewable diesel or if we bring in three million litres of renewable diesel, because volume makes a difference to price.

The second thing that I will say is that it changes over time. So, we have numbers today, but, of course, everyone knows that when we go to the pumps, things change here and there, so I don't want — I please don't want to — these are examples.

We looked at the Lower Mainland — well, I think what the department did was to talk to North 60 Petro to ask them about some of these potential impacts to price. So, if we got a million litres of diesel here, then the price of the renewable diesel might be 60 cents per litre higher — six-zero cents per litre higher — so, if — I don't know — diesel is in the range of \$1 to \$2 right now, it would go up to \$2.40 or \$2.60 — in that range. If we got in three million litres of renewable diesel, then the price would instead be 30 cents per litre higher, so that's the range. If you think of that 30 cents, then that would be like a 15-percent increase on the price of — at the pump. Those are roughly the examples that we have to work with at this moment.

Mr. Kent: Thank you, Madam Chair; I appreciate that, and I appreciate the department doing the research and getting that information for the minister in a very timely manner so that we could have that discussion.

I wanted to jump over now to the zero-emission vehicles. If the minister can remind me, I believe that the last time we were here, he mentioned a number of zero-emission vehicles that are registered. I just wanted him to confirm that number. I think it was in the high 400s, but I wanted him to get a chance to confirm that.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Yes, the number that I gave last week I think when we were here was 467 vehicles, which is currently the number of zero-emission vehicles registered here in the Yukon. I don't have new numbers since last week.

Mr. Kent: So, 467 — so, the 2022 numbers which are in the most recent annual report that the government tabled last December — at that time, there were 204, and it was split between the battery/electric, or BEV, and the plug-in hybrid vehicles. Does the minister have the breakdown between the BEVs and PHEVs that are registered — of the 467?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Folks are working to try to see if they can get that breakdown. Maybe we can just keep going with questions. As soon as I get the answer, I'll be sure to pop up.

Mr. Kent: The battery/electric vehicles, I understand, are zero-emission vehicles, but the plug-in hybrid electric vehicles do have some emissions. So, can the minister explain why they are considered zero-emission vehicles as well — the plug-in ones?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The question that the member opposite poses really depends on how the vehicle owners use their vehicle. For example, if they are driving under 50 kilometres a day, they tend to be zero-emission vehicles, and then if you are doing a trip up to Dawson, then they are not — or Watson Lake or wherever you are going. It really matters how they are being used. We will hunt around to see if there is any research about the usage, but generally speaking, they are a huge improvement — there is a huge difference on emissions for the plug-in hybrid over the internal combustion engine vehicles.

Then, with response to the earlier question, about two-thirds of the total registered vehicles are battery and about one-third are plug-in hybrids.

Mr. Kent: I was curious about why the PHEVs were considered zero emission, especially given some of the distances. In looking at article in *The Globe and Mail*, it said that they looked at 45 different models in 2024, and there was a Mercedes Benz that had the greatest electric range at 77 kilometres, and then the smallest range was eight kilometres of those 45 vehicles. That is quite a range, and for people who live in some of the communities around Whitehorse and commute into the city, this certainly isn't the best option, and it would end up being a vehicle that does have emissions.

I will look forward to hearing back from the minister on the reasons why these PHEVs are considered zero-emission vehicles.

I did want to jump back over to this 467 number, because I believe that when we were up last time, the minister said that we were on track with that to meet the 4,800-vehicle target by 2030, but when I looked at the 2022 annual report, it says that, in 2024, we were expected to be just under 1,000 zero-emission vehicles registered, but we are just under 500. I am just trying to get a sense — or if the minister can reconcile that to where he feels like we are on track, but we are only at 50 percent of where we should be at this point.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: A few points — the first one is that, if the electric range of the vehicle is under 50 kilometres,

the rebate or incentive is diminished. It's \$3,000 rather than \$5,000. You need that range of 50 kilometres in order to get it, so most of our plug-in hybrids are of the longer range. The average travel distance per average Yukon vehicle is 25 kilometres, but that's heavily skewed by whether you are inside Whitehorse or out in the communities. Of course, those rebates that I'm talking about are matched by the federal rebates as well, so the dollars are more for the purchaser — the Yukoner. I am just giving the Yukon numbers.

I just asked the department again about whether the numbers we have put us in line with what they are anticipating for the growth in sales. Yes is the answer. The 467 that I'm reporting would be to the end of September, so the end of the third quarter, so we have one more quarter. It looks like it has been ramping up in this last quarter with sales, so the percentage of vehicles that are transitioning away from internal combustion engine vehicles is increasing each quarter.

I have asked them again to just go back and look, but it looks — they're describing it to me as matching the projection that we had.

Again, the Yukon is coming in third nationally after BC and Québec in terms of sales on a per capita basis. It's actually pretty impressive.

Mr. Kent: So, the last time that we were here, the minister — I think he said 12 percent of sales in the last quarter. Just if he can confirm that percentage and then just tell us how many vehicles that actually represents. What's the number of vehicles sold?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: That's correct, Madam Chair. We are seeing that percentage increase. After we had the conversation in the Assembly last Tuesday — I'm talking with the Minister of Highways and Public Works who let me know about one of the dealers — the numbers were much higher in terms of the percentages.

So, it's really — we had a problem previously with supply, but now, it looks like supply is — there is more supply available, and Yukoners are increasingly purchasing these vehicles.

Mr. Kent: So, how many new EVs were purchased in the last quarter? That 12-percent number, what does that translate to in the number of actual vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The numbers that I have from April 1 of this year to September 30: 104 zero-emission vehicles, two heavy-duty zero-emission vehicles, and one plug-in hybrid.

Mr. Kent: I appreciate that. I'm sure that once we get the next annual report, I will probably have some more questions. You know, if you include the last quarter of this year, then we have one, two, three, four, five — six more years left to reach the target of 4,800 vehicles. So, we've got about — you know, we're 4,300 short.

Looking at the projections, it's really going to ramp up after 2026. I will be curious to check in with the minister in the spring after the 2023 annual report is out.

The last item I wanted to touch on is with respect to the charging stations. In 2022, there were 12 fast chargers that were

in the Government of Yukon's network throughout the territory. Can the minister give us an updated number on that?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: When the team did their planning or their analysis to see about the growth of zero-emission vehicles, it's not meant to be linear. You know, what they anticipated and what does look to be happening is that we will ramp up the number of sales, and it will start to displace the internal combustion engine sales, and then it will taper off in time. That is why the projection, you know, that we have given — and the team feels that we are generally on track, and I agree that we should keep watching it and keep reporting on it and see how we are doing.

With respect to fast chargers or electric vehicle charging around the territory and what kind of infrastructure we now have, we now have 19 direct-current fast chargers in service, and they are sort of — they are spaced around the territory so that we can have people travelling from our communities.

We have over 100 level-two public chargers. I think that just 11 or a dozen of them are ones that the government has put in place. There are about 95 that we have provided support or the incentive for the installation of around the Yukon.

Mr. Kent: That is a good jumping off to a question that I wanted to ask the minister about implementing fees at the government-owned electric vehicle charging stations. In an April 15, 2024 article from the *Whitehorse Star* at the time, it says — "Fees planned for YG charging stations" is the title. There is a quote from the minister here that says, "I agree that we should seek to start charging a fee at the recharging stations. I have asked the department to bring that forward as quickly as possible..." The minister goes on to say, "They are working on that. I think that under Our Clean Future, the target date for that is 2025. I have asked them to try to accelerate that to this year."

Will the charging fees be in place for this year, or are we looking to 2025?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The department has gone off and done the work in the background. It's now in the system, where it has to move through the Cabinet committee's process. I don't have a timeline in front of me yet, but the department did the work as I requested, and it is now in that internal government side of it to bring it forward.

Mr. Kent: With respect to the government-owned level 2 chargers such as the ones that are located here at the Legislative Assembly building and the main administration building — the Jim Smith Building — I know that some owners of electric vehicles are concerned that when they are looking to charge their vehicles, there are conventional combustion vehicles that are parked there. Are there any plans in place to restrict those level 2 chargers that are here at the YG building to only electric vehicles for charging, or is there a critical number of registered vehicles that the minister is looking at before implementing something like that?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: We are working to foster the parking behaviour so that we support that it is electric vehicles that will have access to those spots where the chargers are. I think that we are looking to see how that behaviour occurs over time. I think that both the department and Highways and Public Works are aware of the question. At this point, we don't have

any plans to try to put in enforcement or rules around the parking, but we are watching to see how those behaviours play out so that we can see if we can foster it without having to bring in rules.

Mr. Kent: That concludes my questions in general debate. I thank the minister and his officials for attending here today.

Ms. White: Thank you to the minister and officials today for continuing on debate in conversation around the *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*.

I am going to take it from a bit of a different angle, because I think that my own journey in understanding and maybe learning is partially what I am going to bring to this debate today. I will say that there is a sign that hangs in our office in the hallway that goes back toward the boardroom. It's important to know that this hallway has some things that I have collected over the years that ring important to me. As an example, there are two full-page ads from newspapers at the time that were citizen-led ads against the then Yukon Party government's plan on changing the Peel watershed land use plan. I say that because that was a very impactful time for me and to see citizen engagement.

On the opposite side of the wall, there is a sign that was written by a young teenager that says: You will die of old age; we'll die of climate change.

I have brought that up numerous times over the years in this Assembly. The reason that I do is that, when you have a conversation with a young person who tries to describe how they feel about the future and when they tell you that they don't see a future — they're unsure if there's a future — because of climate change, it kind of changes your perspective.

To be perfectly frank, there are times when I have not fully understood the enormity of those feelings when they have been expressed to me by young people. Then I recognize that I stand here closer to 50 than to 40 and much closer to 50 than to 20 and much closer to 50 than to 15. There is all sorts of terminology, whether we talk about climate grief or climate dread, but the reality is that young people right now are living with a huge weight — a huge weight of anxiety.

It's beyond anxiety. I'm going to quickly read from an article from *The New Republic* — and it says: "Stop Calling It 'Climate Anxiety.' It's Climate Dread.

"The phrase 'climate dread' better legitimizes the real and tangible threat coming toward us."

The article goes on to say: "When burdened by the tangible angst and unease around the future of our planet, a term like 'climate anxiety' can seem insufficient. It can feel paltry and shallow, implying we are fretting or fussing over an imagined future. In reality, seeing the mounting global disasters and learning of evidence-based projections of our changing world comes with a heavy emotional gravity. For some, 'anxiety' simply doesn't do it justice. For people like Freed — and myself, and potentially you, reading this now — the phrase 'climate dread,' better than 'climate anxiety,' legitimizes the real and tangible threat coming toward us and communicates that fear to others.

"The importance of this distinction is not just etymological. The emotion of dread affects us differently from anxiety."

The reason why I bring that forward is that the reality is that my colleague, my friend, and the MLA for Whitehorse Centre is much closer to 30 than to 60 and is about to bring two lives into the world. So, when they discuss with me their dread and fear of the future, that brings us to spots like this where we talk about our actions.

During the debate on my proposed amendment to the *Elections Act*, one of the minister's colleagues said that it was about putting pieces in place — making sure that we had pieces in place for the future. So, when we look at the *Clean Energy Act* and we look at the timeline, the reality is that we have to try harder — absolutely harder. I mean, I could read from — I could read from it better if I pulled it up.

We could talk about the report of — the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report that summarizes the state of knowledge on climate change, its widespread impacts and risks and climate change mitigation and adaptation, and I have to say that it's bleak. There is not a lot of hope in that document.

When we talk about trying to make an amendment to the timeline, we know that it won't be easy. But every time that I go to a climate rally and then we have the chant — there is the chant that happens where it says: You'll die of old age, and we'll die of climate change — it hits it home in a way that very few other chants really get to me. There is no Planet B. There are all sorts of ones that get yelled out, but that one — you'll die of old age, and we'll die of climate change — is fundamental in our efforts right now to have this conversation about that timeline.

I appreciate that there is no question in the statement that I have just made, but it's the thoughts that I have. The minister is, of course, welcome to respond and I'm interested in hearing that. But I think about all those young people with whom I have those conversations and who tell me that they're not sure about what their future holds because they don't know if they have one.

I appreciate that the minister said that we are talking about a livable planet for all. Well, we've already seen climate refugees. We have already started seeing the effects of that when a country is based on farming and can no longer farm. We have seen that effect.

I fundamentally believe that our actions here, like the butterfly effect, don't just affect us here, but they affect the planet. In India, they have rolling brownouts to try to bring down their emissions and people are dying of heat exhaustion. Those are real actions. They have consequences that are huge. Sometimes, I look at our actions and what we're doing in Canada and I think that we just don't go far enough because it's uncomfortable and it will be inconvenient.

So, I think that when we're talking about this right now, it's important that we recognize and acknowledge the climate dread that so many young people in our communities are feeling here at home. I'm not even talking about nationally. So, that's where we are coming from. That's where I am coming from today in today's debate.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Back in 2006-07, I was one of the reviewers of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report. That report is so huge. It's massive. I was asked to be a reviewer for the chapter dealing with the polar regions because I was then the manager for research groups in the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut. I have been around this science a lot. Throughout that time, one of my jobs was to talk to classrooms. Amazingly, I have been in classes as young as grade 2, I think, to try to talk about these issues. Of course, you want to be very careful not to bring in dread, angst, or anxiety around it, but you want to bring in fair information to help kids learn. When kids are older, we start talking about some of those harder subjects.

Yes, I have been around this subject a lot and talked with a lot of young people about it. I will say that when I was in that age range, closer to 16 than 60 — actually, I turned 62 yesterday. So, when I was young, I had a concern, and my concern was about global thermal nuclear warfare, and amazingly, I feel that concern coming back today.

As a young person, I tried to navigate that thinking, and that was what helped to shape my thinking about care for this planet and this place. When I think about any group — us as human beings — and if we base our model on growth and consumption, sooner or later, you have to reach limits. Back then, back during the late 1960s, early 1970s, the worry was around population — that we would put too much pressure on the system, but really, the issue is our consumption and how much consumption we have, especially in the western world — our consumption — and oftentimes wastefulness of our consumption.

I had hoped, when I first got involved in sort of teaching about climate change and talking about it, that in the late 1980s, early 1990s, this would be the lesson that we would learn — that we need to rein in our consumption. I now think that it will not. That has been disappointing for me, but I have always believed that you need to be up front with information. It doesn't matter what age we are talking about, whether it is young people or old people — whatever the age is of people — that we need to give them fair information, and then they should hold us to account for our actions.

There are going to be a few points that I am going to raise as we talk about this amendment when it comes, and I thank the members opposite for flagging it for me, but I am going to talk about one point right now, because that slogan that hits the member opposite when it comes from young Yukoners is not actually correct — and I tried to say that earlier in a kind way.

So, is it right — like, I care that people care — that is great — and that they are motivated to do it, but I also care that they are fairly informed, and in this instance — and I have struggled with that very phrase all the time. I remember that each time I hear it; I go and talk with my wife about it, whether I should try to help those young people to know that they are not likely to die of climate change, but people on the planet are likely to die of climate change, and we should care about that.

So, the sentiment is — the intention is good, but it's not quite correct. Anyway, I don't want to hide behind the fact that

this is a serious problem. We need serious action, and we should be held to account for that action. I agree with that.

That is why I think that we have come with what we've come with, and I just will put forward why I believe and why the department has convinced me that this is the right approach, and I agree with it. I will hold it up to the light, and I will be held accountable for it — or we as a government will or whatever pronoun is appropriate there.

So, I think that the point that is being made that climate change is an incredibly serious topic is correct. I think that it has a lot of deep, deep concern for people who look ahead for what kind of planet we are creating is correct. We need to address this. There is no question of the imperative, in my opinion. I think we need to adopt the best course of action to actually reduce emissions and make this transition away from fossil fuels.

I agree with all of that, and I appreciate those young people who look to help shape that future together, whether it is motivated by concern for their planet, concern for themselves — and their future here in the Yukon is less important to me. What is important is that we need action on climate change.

Ms. White: I'm just going to collect my thoughts on the fly here.

I have to say that I'm both surprised — or I guess it's surprising: the minister's recent statements. I guess I invite him to have conversations with youth about how their dread is misplaced and about how they don't have to worry about dying of climate change because they were born in North America and live in the Yukon. I think that's a real way to celebrate our privilege, to say:, Oh, don't worry; you're not going to die, but others will.

You know, at this point in time, there is an average of 21.5 million people who are forcefully displaced each year by weather-related events — between 2008 and 2016 — known as “climate refugees”. Climate refugees are people who have been forcefully displaced by climate change-related disasters. It might not be kids in the Yukon, for sure, but I definitely care about kids in other places, which is partially why we are talking about this goal.

According to a BBC article, two million people have died in extreme weather-related events since 1970. I guess that's not too many people if we think about weather and climate, and those kinds of changes are just going to escalate. We just have to look at the wildfire seasons and how those are changing. People die around us in those events. I would suggest that they are climate-related.

I appreciate the minister's point about reining in our consumption, being up front with information, sharing fair information and then, most importantly, holding us to account for our actions, because I believe that this is an opportunity. I feel like if my nephews are doing a science — or something for school around climate change and they read what I have said in the Assembly, I'm going to be okay with that. I'm going to be okay with what they ask me and why I said what I said. I will be okay with that. The minister can be okay with his statements — that is totally up to him, but I believe that right now, as we are seeing the effects of climate change in other places that are

having incredibly adverse effects on people's ability to live and their ability to thrive, it's a concern. The decisions that we make here affect people outside of the Yukon. They affect people outside of the country. They affect people on the other side of the planet. They will affect people we will never know about, because we also have the ability to make decisions.

The minister has talked about leadership at different points and about the importance of leading. I believe that this is an example, but I'm pretty sure that I have said what I needed to say about that, but I am surprised by the comments.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: First of all, earlier today, when we started Committee of the Whole, I talked about Sudan and Chad. I didn't say that we don't need to act — we do, and I will continue to say that. What I also said is that it's important that we give people fair information.

Look, I have been around this issue for so long. I have watched as people moved from denialism to despair in a heartbeat, and still, I know that what we need is serious action on climate change. The member opposite will know that we have at times pointed to programs that we believe are part of our initiative around *Our Clean Future* which we didn't get to, because there was a difference of opinion here in this Assembly — where we were on the side of saying: Hey, we need to go harder faster; and the members opposite said: No, something else is a priority. So, it is tough — these decisions are not simple, and I have seen those examples. One of the ones that I will point to in all of this — because we are talking about mining emissions — is the fact that, in order to make this transition away from fossil fuels, we will need critical minerals. No one talks about that.

So, when I go to talk to the youth groups about climate change and they say: Hey, let's shut down mining, I say back to them: No, I think that is a mistake, because if you do that, we won't be able to transition away from fossil fuels. We need copper, we need nickel, and our solar panels need silver. Absolutely, we should have more recycling, which we were talking about today, and we should make sure to do everything that we can to have reuse of all materials before we even get to recycling, but even still, the engineer in me knows that we are going to need mining. That is where it gets really tough.

I have folks who say that we should address climate change but we shouldn't have mining, and usually I think to myself that they don't know what is needed to address climate change. So, that is the hard part of the debate. I agree with the member opposite, and I think that my words in this Assembly have stated the same thing: that it's not a question of whether young people here will face the same impacts that climate refugees will, because I don't think that they will here, but we need to make this transition.

I think that I started off earlier talking about the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and how it is supposed to be us, as the western countries — or the countries that were able to have an industrial revolution earlier, which led to some of these causes but also gave us those economic advantages. So, I feel that our responsibility is actually higher here, and we need to make that transition, but it doesn't mean

that there aren't challenging decisions in front of us, and mining is exactly one of those decisions.

It's important to have mining; it's important to get mining right — well, sorry — for critical minerals. Let me be careful, because precious metals are not needed for this transition to deal with climate change.

I am not trying in any way to diminish or take away the concern that young people here have shown. I certainly want young people to know that what their slogans are saying and whether they are correct or not — that's not the main point. The main point is that climate change is urgent, and we need to have serious action to address it. Again, I think that what we have put forward in this amendment to the *Clean Energy Act* has the best chance of emissions reductions. I think that the amendment that the Yukon NDP are looking to propose will actually have less chance of achieving those emission reductions, so that's why I disagree; it's not for all of the other rationale around it — the imperative is there regardless, but I believe that the execution is not correct.

Anyway, when we get to that debate, we'll get there. But please, if we are going to talk about how this is the highest imperative, then you need to understand what is needed to achieve it, and that, for me, is what's important.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*?

Seeing none, we will proceed to clause-by-clause.

On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Ms. White: Just before I get started, I will say that there was no obligation for us to let the minister know that we were going to move an amendment here. We did that because we believe that, if we want to have a full conversation, it's about letting someone know ahead of time as opposed to springing it on them — something I think that we could learn from here occasionally. So, there was a lot of heads up here.

So, section 4, which talks about 5.01, mining sector interim reduction targets — in subsection (1), it says: "Subject to subsection (3), the reduction target for mining sector emissions in Yukon is an emissions intensity reduction of 45% for 2035 and subsequent years from the emissions intensity for the baseline year 2023."

Further, going on to subsection (3), it says: "The Minister may, from time to time and after engaging with representatives of the mining sector or a subsector of the mining sector, recommend to the Commissioner in Executive Council

"(a) the setting, amending or revoking of a reduction target for mining sector emissions for the mining sector or a subsector of the mining sector for a year after 2035 that applies to that year and subsequent years..."

So, Madam Chair, it's going to be no surprise that we have indicated what our intention is here.

Amendment proposed

Ms. White: I move:

THAT clause 4 of Bill No. 40, *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, be amended on page 4 by replacing both instances of the year “2035” with the year “2030”.

Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Takhini-Kopper King:

THAT clause 4 of Bill No. 40, *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, be amended on page 4 by replacing both instances of the year “2035” with the year “2030”.

The amendment is in order.

Is there any debate on the amendment?

Ms. White: Madam Chair, I believe that the amendment that we are bringing forward is self-explanatory, but I will leave space for my colleague from Whitehorse Centre to explain it more. I’m happy to hear from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I look forward to hearing from the Member for Whitehorse Centre as well. I also want to just acknowledge that I appreciate the heads-up. Last week, when the Member for Whitehorse Centre talked about it, I asked the department folks to take a look at it.

Just a few comments. How are we going to get more emissions reductions? That’s mostly what I care about. I appreciate that this is about what we set as a target, but I care about emissions reductions, because that’s what the climate will care about. Part of this is: How do we set serious and ambitious goals and have the process in place to achieve them? One of the things that will make this happen is if I have an industry — in this case, an industry but whatever it is — or sector that is supporting it and trying to get there — I will say to this House that, when I first started working with the mining sector, I wasn’t sure that they were going to be on board with making this transition. I have been impressed by the mining sector and what they have done and brought forward.

Both the team who we worked with to do the modelling to understand about emissions reductions and the industry itself talked about having a runway: the time it’s going to take to get these emissions reductions. The direction that I gave to the department was that the target that we set here needs to be serious, needs to be ambitious, and needs to get us toward 2050 and zero emissions.

So, the industry came back and talked about what they would like to see. What they needed was time to get that in place.

So, today, if what happens is that we pass this amendment, I think what happens is the industry will just tune out from us, and then I think that it will be harder to get those emissions reductions. Let me give a really clear example.

We recently got funding through the critical minerals infrastructure fund to look at grid connect. Connecting the Yukon’s grid to the British Columbia grid isn’t just about critical minerals, but it certainly will help critical minerals, and it will also help, for example, with the Faro clean-up, because if we have that grid connect in place, then we can work to say to industry: Hey, we can make sure to supply electricity which is renewable, and if you are going to make that transition in

purchasing equipment that will head toward electric mining equipment, you will know that we have that supply — because right now, we don’t have that supply on hand.

The grid connect — that project, we look at it, and we think to ourselves that it is about a decade-long project; to get from today, where we are talking about it, to when we have the potential of having the grid connected is about a decade. That is the sort of thing that would lead to a lot of emissions reduction, but look at how it happens. The mining industry was part of the group that talked to the federal minister to say: This is really important for us, because we believe that critical minerals are important for addressing this energy transition, and we believe that we need to do it in the right way.

But say that we, today, start to set that target differently. How would those mining companies then decide whether or not to be part of this? They might turn around and say: No, you know what? The Yukon is not serious about this, and they are going to impose things on us that don’t look realistic. Part of this in my mind is around needing a mineral industry in order to get the transition away from fossil fuels. This is just this very clear example where, if what we do is set targets that don’t have some way to realize them other than shutting mining down — which would realize it but, of course, wouldn’t help us on that path to the transition away from fossil fuels — they would just be: Somebody else should deal with it.

That is the question that I have, is that — today, with the target at 2035, we have an industry that sees a way to be part of this and is willing to make that effort.

If we set that target to 2030, we lose that. So, in the end, we can stand and say that we did the right thing and said it, but we don’t get the outcome. I think you have to have that sense of looking to work to get that emissions reduction.

I understand the principle of what’s being put before us, but the practice of it is that I think it leads to poorer outcomes in emissions reductions, which is what the climate will care about.

MLA Tredger: I have been thinking a lot for a while, especially in the last week, about why the Liberals would choose a target for reducing emissions that does not meet the minimum requirements for ensuring a livable planet. It’s the question that I tried to get an answer to last week when we debated the bill.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has said a lot of things. He has talked about the — quote: “blurriness” of the recommendations from the UN. He has talked about how he composts and he has talked a lot about practicalities. After listening very carefully to a lot of speeches, I think that it is in the end about the practicalities — that he doesn’t think it’s possible or at least he’s not willing to pay the cost of making it happen. So, instead, the Liberals have chosen a goal that is serious and ambitious but is ultimately inadequate for a livable planet for all.

Sometimes I think that the Liberals have forgotten that, when we’re talking about climate change and we’re talking about physical laws of nature, we can’t tell the climate that our goals were really ambitious and our goals were really serious, so hold off, please, on the climate change.

I used this analogy earlier today and I want to use it again, because I think it's a good one. Imagine stepping off a cliff and saying: Hey, gravity, I've got a really good plan to build a bridge in five years. It's an ambitious plan. It's a serious plan. I couldn't find a path to get it done any sooner. Those things might be true, but you can't explain them to gravity. If you step off a cliff without having built a bridge, it doesn't matter how good your reasons are; you are going to fall.

There's another possibility, of course, as to why the Liberals have proposed targets that fall short of what the UN has called for — a possibility that I genuinely hadn't considered until the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes' remarks today. The best word I can think of for them is "chilling". He started by correcting my use of the term "livable planet" and said that a better term would be "livable for all". He clarified that parts of the world, like the place that we live, would likely still be livable, even if we missed the targets set out by the UN.

Later, he said that when young Yukoners say, "You'll die of old age; we'll die of climate change", that's not accurate — again because the Yukon will likely be okay. I guess that he doesn't understand that when young Yukoners say "we", they don't just mean themselves and the people who live in their city, territory, or country. They just don't mean their peers with money and privilege; they mean everyone; they mean young people across the world. They care about young people across the world.

I think that assuming that they don't understand that is condescending at best, and I'm very proud of the young Yukoners who are standing up knowing that it's not them who will be the first to pay the price for climate inaction; it is their peers around the world. I am so proud of them for standing up for everyone.

Anyway, whatever the reason is for the Liberals to propose targets that are inadequate for a livable planet, we do not accept it. Last week, I told the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes that unless he tables evidence that reducing 45 percent by 2035 instead of 2030 is enough to ensure a livable planet, we would move the amendment that is before us that would change the target to 2030 because, according to scientific consensus, that is what is required to have a livable planet. Yes, it's not a perfectly precise number. Yes, it's an estimate, but the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes hasn't given us any better estimates. Despite talking about how he has been around the science for a long time, he hasn't tabled anything or referenced anything that would give us a better target to aim for.

So, we're going with the best estimate that we have, because the Yukon NDP will not give up on the hope of a livable future. We will not write off the possibility of a livable planet for all for future generations. We will listen to the best available scientific evidence about what our climate targets should be, and that is what we'll fight for.

I want to remind the other parties that they have a choice. The Liberals can keep trying to argue with the laws of nature, the Yukon Party can keep ignoring climate change altogether, or they can all change course and commit to a livable future for the planet. Because here's another thing that the UN is clear

about: It's not too late. It's getting more difficult every day, but it's not too late. We still have hope for a livable future. I really hope that everyone in this House believes that, and I really hope that everyone in this House believes that's worth fighting for.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I'll say a few more things and then possibly we will get to a vote on the amendment.

I feel it coming already. My frustration is not with the young people who are out there raising their voices and talking about it, but I am frustrated with the NDP at the moment. Part of it is — and I'm not sure where they stand, for example, on carbon pricing, and I wonder. We were the last government — and I was proud to listen to our Premier speak about it this past spring — and I know that the Official Opposition now has landed with "axe the tax". Tomorrow, what I'll do is I will table their platform, which talks about a made-in-Yukon carbon price.

So, there are things that I get frustrated about, and one of them is that there is going to be this move into the public sphere and the media about how we as a government don't support addressing climate change, which is so not correct. I have been proud of the work that we have done, because I have been around these plans for a long time and I can tell you that this plan that we have is something to hold up.

Part of what you need to address climate change turns out to be critical minerals. So, in this discussion, for example, I don't hear where the NDP is on that. What I hear is that they're angling to say that we don't want a livable planet for all. That's so wrong, but I leave it to them about how they will put this out publicly.

But the part that grabs me is that, underneath it, I understand that they have said no to mining. If that's their goal, then I take our plan hands down as achieving the path toward transitioning away from fossil fuels, because it's not enough to just sort of say: I'm going to shut this stuff down and somebody else deal with the problem.

No, we need critical minerals, and the Yukon turns out to be one of the places that has a lot of them. So, we need to do mining right; that's for sure. It's critical that we get mining right, and mining is critical to make this transition.

Right now, with this proposed bill in front of us, we have that ability, but what the NDP will do is to seek to make it so that they can stand on moral high ground while working to undermine that ability to achieve the reductions. That is what I talked about. It wasn't about whether this was needed or not; it was about how best to achieve it.

I just say that it is pretty important to be working toward a mining sector that has renewable energy, that has that ability, for example, for us to clean up Faro — and with enough renewable energy on our grid that we could do it in a way that won't use a lot of fossil fuels. The proposal is just pushing those goals further away.

I am going to go back. I have been thinking about this a lot. I am sure that all members of this House have — well, sorry. Folks from the NDP and us have been thinking about this a lot. I am not sure where the Yukon Party is at on it; we will see in a second, I'm sure.

When we talked about carbon pricing in this House, that is an action that is broad and addresses all. I had thought, after we had our second election fighting about this topic, that we landed and got to a resolution. Then I saw, as the federal Liberals made a change to it — and it just started crumbling all over the place. Others premiers, as the members of the Yukon Party have noted, have all said: Yes, we are opposed to it.

But let me just say for Yukoners out there that this is an important policy. This policy — I don't know right now where the NDP is on it, but I have seen their colleagues in British Columbia bail on it —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Chair: Member for Takhini-Kopper King, on a point of order.

Ms. White: Madam Chair, section 19(b) speaks to matters other than the question under discussion. Right now, we are talking about an amendment — 2035 to 2030. I am happy to have conversations with the minister at another point, but right now, it is on an amendment that is very specific. It is about changing a timeline.

Chair's ruling

Chair: The member needs to get back to the topic.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: So, what the members opposite talked about in their amendment was a livable planet, so that's what I'm talking about. These are all issues that lead to this notion of a livable planet. On the one hand, I think that they are saying that this timeline needs to be changed, because that's what the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says, but they're not talking about how to achieve it. Then they are ignoring these other issues, which you need as well, including mining. Yet that won't be discussed. Instead, I'm just reading the press release in my head. Yes, I'm frustrated because I have spent my life working to achieve this stuff and have always tried to balance that serious ambition with the practical reality of how to achieve it. This is a compromise of that, which I think is important.

I think that this is being framed as some sort of moral argument, which I just frankly disagree with, because I have never, in my decades working on this issue, come across a government that has been so committed to trying to achieve this and has made all this effort to work with First Nations, with municipalities, with Yukoners, and with industry sectors and has developed this very impressive plan — *Our Clean Future* — and this is about making sure that we can hold this to account. That is what this timeline is about.

I appreciate that we're talking about this important issue. I disagree with the amendment.

Chair: Is there any further debate on the amendment?
Are you prepared for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Count.

Count

Chair: A count has been called

Bells

Chair: All those in favour, please rise.

Members rise

Chair: All those opposed, please rise.

Members rise

Chair: The results are two yea, 15 nay.

Amendment to clause 4 negatived

Chair: Is there any further debate on clause 4?

Ms. White: Can the minister tell me if there is any differentiating between precious metals or critical minerals in his definition of “mining sector interim reduction targets”?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The answer is no.

Ms. White: So, if it's so important — and I don't disagree; I think critical minerals are critical to a renewable future, and I totally appreciate when the minister takes my standing with the Na-Cho Nyäk Dun out of context, but we could talk about land use planning and we could talk about First Nation sovereignty and the ability to make decisions on traditional territory, but I was just going to talk about this *Clean Energy Act*.

If the minister makes so many — if he highlights the difference between precious metals and critical minerals, why aren't there two separate targets? Why haven't we said that precious metals are going to be in a different classification, critical minerals in a different classification? Why is there not a difference between precious metals and critical minerals? The minister has been so very clear that one is obviously critical and one is not, so why has he not made the difference in the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: An analogy for me would be to talk about the Yukon-wide target. We have within the Yukon-wide target food production — agriculture — which is incredibly critical for life and sustainability here. We also have within it leisure, which I think is good for mental wellness and health, but it's not — it doesn't have the same criticality — but they both have the same target. So, the target is about the whole of the sector. We want both to reduce their emissions, both mining for precious metals and for critical minerals. We want them both to reduce emissions over time and move toward net zero by 2050.

Ms. White: What are the consequences if a mining company doesn't live up to this reduction?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The *Clean Energy Act* is about the responsibility of government to make sure that we are reducing emissions here in the Yukon over time. For example, in the other part of this act where we talk about the Yukon's emissions target, we don't say that, if there is a specific business inside of it that is not achieving the emissions reductions, they would be penalized. We do have programs. For example, there are incentives out there to help businesses or individuals — Yukoners — to move away from fossil fuels, so we try to incent those practices. We do try to support polluter-pay models so that, if you're not part of it, you would end up paying more.

The same is true of the mining industry. That is the goal. It's not about targeting a specific mine; it's about the government's responsibility for us to achieve these targets over time.

Ms. White: At the briefing that I had, I actually wrote down — and I'm quoting myself here: "No consequences to industry if target is not met". That was the question I asked in the briefing, and I was told by the officials that there was no consequence.

The difference between *Our Clean Future* and what we have here in the *Clean Energy Act* is that you're naming the business. You are naming the industry. You're saying the mining industry will reduce its emission targets. You are saying that they will reduce their emissions and that they have targets to achieve, but there's no consequence. There's no difference between precious minerals, critical minerals — the minister talked about leisure or critical to the renewable future — and there was no difference between those two. There are no consequences for industry if they don't meet the targets is what I was told in the briefing.

When we talk about this clause here, the minister accused the NDP of moral high ground. When we have targets that have no consequences, when we have targets that don't differentiate between leisure minerals and critical minerals and there are no consequences to industry but you get to put it in a document, is that not the moral high ground? To be able to say that we're legislating targets?

I'm just looking for a little bit of clarification. So, we have named the mining industry in this. The difference in *Our Clean Future* is that we don't name industry; we don't say separate businesses. But in this *Clean Energy Act*, we name mining. We're talking about the mining sector. So, what are the consequences for a mine that doesn't live up to this? There has to be something. Because the minister accused the NDP of taking the moral high ground on this, my expectation is then that this actually has teeth, that it actually has consequence, but I'm not understanding how.

So, how does the government make sure that the mining industry lives up to this? What is in the toolkit to make this an actual reality?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: So, the first one is that there are other sectors named in the *Clean Energy Act* — so, the heating sector, if you like, and transportation — well, vehicles. So, there are other targets that are set — again, no consequences if they're not met, but they're there.

The reason that mining has been pulled out — and I think we've already sort of had this argument here on the floor, but it's about the fact that mining has significant swings in terms of activity.

So, if you set a physical target for it, you could have two possible perverse outcomes. The first one is that, if you set a target that is high and then, when the mining sector takes a downswing, people can claim that they have reduced emissions, but that has not really happened; what has really happened is that the sector has taken a downswing. Or there is the opposite where the sector takes an upswing and you can't achieve things like critical minerals or, for example, cleaning up Faro. Those

are the reasons why we went to pulling the sector out. It's because it has so much variability that we have seen over time.

In terms of: Are there consequences for companies? First of all, I talked about some of the ways in which mines — or any company for that matter — for example, under a carbon price — if they choose to or opt to use more fossil fuels, then they will pay more into the system. Because everybody is rebated — for businesses, depending on your size, and individuals per person — then you would lose out that way. So, there are incentives and disincentives.

Then, the place where the member asked about the toolkit and what we have for trying to achieve these things — and I think that it is there under *Our Clean Future*. It is not the *Clean Energy Act*. The *Clean Energy Act* is about publicly stating the targets so that there is an obligation that, if they are going to be changed, we have to come back to this Legislative Assembly to do that, and so that there is a more public-facing piece of it where we would share progress and information about how we are working to achieve those targets over time.

I think that finally one of the ways in which I have worked with the mining sector — maybe two ways. The first one is that even for those people who don't believe in climate change — and there still are folks out there who have that perspective — they almost always agree with that notion of reducing waste. So, if they can somehow find ways to use less fossil fuels — great. That is some alignment that we have, and I think that the public, especially with the larger mines, will have a hope for them to be working to reduce emissions.

I have said today on the floor of the Assembly that those mines that I have worked with care about this issue and have sought to work in this direction, and I think that the public will want to hear from them about what they're trying to do in order to achieve that. So, it's more I guess about a social licence question. I think that is the range of ways — just in responding to the question here on the floor — for how there are consequences. The *Clean Energy Act*, which I think we passed in 2022, was not about consequences for any business; it was about the responsibility of government to achieve the targets.

Chair: Is there any further debate on clause 4?

Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Clause 7 agreed to

On Clause 8

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Clause 9 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Madam Chair, I move that you report Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes that the Chair report Bill No. 40, entitled

Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024), without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Chair: The matter now before the Committee is general debate on Vote 2, Executive Council Office, in Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*.

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. 215: *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25* — continued

Chair: The matter now before the Committee is general debate on Vote 2, Executive Council Office, in Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*.

Executive Council Office

Chair: Is there any general debate?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Madam Chair, I'm pleased to introduce the supplementary budget for the Executive Council Office for the 2024-25 fiscal year.

I would like to welcome officials Justin Ferbey and Exilda Driscoll for coming in today to support me.

The Executive Council Office is the central agency that provides leadership and guidance to other Government of Yukon departments and organizations.

From policy and communications to Aboriginal Relations and the Youth Directorate, the department shares expertise and information, builds capacity, and ensures coordination to support effective public governance.

Here's a brief overview of the items in our supplementary estimates.

Under the work of Aboriginal Relations, the Government of Yukon remains deeply committed to reconciliation and fostering strong relationships with First Nations. Our Aboriginal Relations branch leads much of this essential work, driving efforts to bring about meaningful change that benefits all Yukoners. We are focused on advancing environmental, economic, and social initiatives that have a lasting positive impact.

To support these efforts, \$1,231,000 is required to support First Nations with consultations, engagement, bilateral negotiations, and implementing final and self-government agreements. This funding will strengthen our relationships with Yukon and transboundary First Nation governments without comprehensive land claim agreements.

Additionally, \$620,000 in funding is being requested to support the Yukon Residential Schools Missing Children project — an important step in acknowledging and addressing our shared history.

Next, I would like to discuss the adjustments to the corporate programs and Intergovernmental Relations budget. Corporate programs and Intergovernmental Relations is a division that includes many branches, including Yukon Water Board and Major Projects Yukon.

The Yukon Water Board plays a key role in issuing water licences for water use and waste deposits in water, as outlined in chapter 14 of the Yukon First Nation final agreements. To address costs related to the dispute application filed by the Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation, the board requires \$315,000 in funding. Additionally, \$120,000 is needed to cover expenses for renewing a licence for the Whitehorse Rapids generation station. With the current licence set to expire in May 2025, Yukon Energy Corporation plans to submit the renewal application in November 2024. Additional costs are anticipated for the technical review by the Yukon Water Board.

We also have a submission regarding Major Projects Yukon to support the participation of First Nations in the development of terms of reference for the ongoing Coffee Gold monitoring program; \$190,000 in funding is required.

The government remains committed to learning from Yukon First Nations and communities about their priorities and interests and how we can best work together on these matters. Collaboration with Yukon First Nation governments is crucial for delivering benefits not only to Yukon First Nation citizens and communities but to all Yukoners.

With that, Madam Chair, I look forward to answering any questions that the members may have about the 2024-25 supplementary budget for the Executive Council Office, and thank you to the officials for being here today and all of the Executive Council Office team who are helping move these priorities forward.

Mr. Kent: I thank the minister for his opening remarks, and we will also take time to welcome his officials who are here to support him today.

I am going to jump right into some questions around ECO's role with respect to the mining and regulatory industry. I know that there are staking bans in place for the Ross River area that went in in 2013, and then there is also a staking ban in place for Liard First Nation, and I believe that went in in 2017 or 2018. I am just curious if the minister can tell us when those bans are set to expire, and then, if he can let us know when the most recent meetings were held with both Ross River Dena Council and the Liard First Nation on them and when the next meetings are planned.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I will just have officials go back to see the exact dates on the OICs for both of those regulations concerning the moratoriums.

A lot of this work, of course, is tied to the work that is being done through Energy, Mines and Resources on our renewal that we have — or our work at the table concerning mining legislation. A lot of this, of course, is unlocking those tools, and the member opposite knows this file well. If you go back to that 2012 court case and you look at the legal findings and you try to figure out the tools that are necessary to comply with declaration 1 and 2, there needed to be work — of course, that has been done. That has been the key work that First Nations

and the Yukon government have been doing over the last few years with respect to the modernization of mining legislation.

What we are also closely watching, it's important to note, and what helps to educate all of us on what works are the legal cases last year — I apologize; I can't go back to the exact time — but the legal proceedings that occurred in British Columbia. The court case from 2012 from Judge Veale was cited in the findings in the BC legal proceedings as well. I will go back to give a little bit of specific information, and I will certainly touch on the meetings that we had with both the Liard First Nation and Ross River — the latest ones — in a second.

The mineral-staking prohibition — YG consented to two mineral declarations, which I just spoke to, in the Yukon portion of Kaska-asserted traditional territory, and the mineral staking prohibitions in the Kaska-asserted traditional territory have been extended from April 2024 — as the member opposite was wondering what the exact date is — for a two-year period and now expire on April 30, 2026. The goal was to get the legislation in place that can meet the terms of declaration 1 and 2 and have enough time to do that.

Concerning RRDC, in 2022, the Yukon government did establish a Yukon government-RRDC senior officials table, and the current focus, it is important to note — although the member opposite's question focuses specifically on the moratorium, the conversation at that table has been broader and as much about land planning and conservation as well as fish and wildlife management. I think that it has been very positive. One thing that we haven't talked about in the House, which I will — I want to thank the officials from all of our departments, because this is the first year that we've gone through in a long, long time that we have gone through a hunting season where Ross River and the Liard First Nation had not communicated in ways they had in the past.

At least one of the leaders had said to me that this is because of the work that is happening at the table with officials, and it's very positive, and you know, that is the work that we want to continue. Again, we're looking at — it all goes together, of course. It's about — it's the legislation — they have representatives at that table. It's about making sure that you look at the land planning process as well as — so, that work can be done over the next couple of years, which, of course, then leads to the interest around the moratorium.

Concerning — I'm just going to look and see if I have — for the Liard First Nation — I just want to get the dates for the member opposite — my last meetings and the officials meetings — I can go back. I think the officials meetings have happened at a higher tempo, but we were — at the end of September, I was in Watson Lake, and we spent some time with leadership at that time, and there was a framework signed off, and that was — it was really about a government-to-government framework to be able to consistently meet from a leadership-to-leadership table, bringing in appropriate ministers when needed and also being able to look at a number of things from land planning to housing to health and social services and beyond.

The last meeting with Ross River I believe was in early October, and I apologize to the House — these have all

happened just in the last — since mid-September. And in that particular meeting, there was very solid work done and a commitment to move forward with the Ross River Dena Council on some of the planning work that they want to do around conservation initiatives, but also the conversation has always been concerning: Where are the areas, of course, of protection, and where are the areas where there is a support and comfort for activity? In my tenure, whether it be in EMR as mines minister or now in this role or Economic Development, we have always been told that was the key to get that work done. Also, just the same dates on the LFN OIC of April 30, 2026 as well.

Mr. Kent: Madam Chair, I appreciate that. I wanted to jump over to the *Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act*. In the minister's mandate letter, it says that he will support the work of the YESAA oversight group to proceed with recommending amendments to YESAA that support a more streamlined assessment process.

At the briefing, we were told that those proposed amendments have been sent to the Government of Canada. I am just wondering if the minister can tell us when those were submitted and when they will be released to the public for review.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I will see exactly from officials when it was submitted. I will have to get the exact date and the language that was sent into Canada. I know that right now in our discussions — I would say for the House that we would like to see this move faster than it is. I know that there was some dialogue around this with industry, and I want to be very clear. I want to go back and be able to define when that was with the Chamber of Mines. There were meetings as well with Yukon First Nation leadership around this work, and in those meetings — later this year, within 2024, I was in a leadership meeting when it was unanimously passed that they would support an amendment to YESAA. Our understanding is that it is working its way through the federal system — the draft language — and part of that, of course, is to then look for drafting instructions at the federal level and then to continue on with the process. The last thing I was told is that it was working its way through the federal system with a draft, but then, I believe that there has to be further dialogue after the language is drafted for the federal process.

I think that as well we were not made aware going into the fall session of Parliament of that language being ready to be attached to any bill. I think that it's making its way through the federal system, and that's where we're at. But yes, these are the discussions have been going on for the last number of years, but it was good to get that draft language off to Ottawa to get some movement on this important work.

Mr. Kent: Is there a public process planned for these amendments? Will the Premier and First Nations be releasing this to the public? Obviously, it's still working its way through the federal system, but there are a number of Yukoners who would like to see exactly what is being asked for, so I'm curious if that is being released or not.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I will get back to see what that federal process looks like. Of course, it wouldn't be the Yukon

government or First Nations releasing that, because we have to wait and see what the final language is that's being proposed by Canada. I believe that there is a consultation process that Canada goes through to come back to the public on this type of work, but we will make sure that we can come back with a chart or example of what the next couple of steps would be.

Mr. Kent: We will look forward to seeing what those proposed amendments are as soon as possible.

Looking through the most recent annual report from YESAB, which is 2022-23, and digging into the timelines for assessments, it says in here, "For the mining sector, the average duration for placer project assessments was 146 days and 163 days for quartz projects. Land development projects took an average of 115 days and 106 days for transportation projects..." So, obviously, this is a big concern to industry.

For those in the placer industry, it's my understanding from talking to a number of placer miners that there could be as many as 200 water licences that need to be renewed in the next three years, so that's a number of assessments. In talking to some of the folks in the industry, they say that the Water Board process is anywhere from four to 18 months plus half a year or so for the YESAA process. I am just curious about what the minister is planning for when all of these licence renewals start to hit YESAB and the water licensing process here over the next few years.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Yes, there is a definite concern. You have both the Water Board — and the other thing that is important to share — and the member may also be aware of this, but if you go back to when the YESAA legislation came in — in 2005 — and then you work forward, there are some significant renewals that are coming into place next year and the next two years after, and it's really about to go through YESAB. So, there is a lot of pressure both on YESAB and on the Water Board.

We have communicated that to the federal minister — Minister Vandal, who will likely be moving on to a different role, but, of course, that's some of the key pieces that we are very concerned with and want to make sure that the federal government is providing the appropriate resources when it comes to the YESAB team. Our team has been working back and forth with them. There is some work — there is work that we have had done in the department; it's in a draft form, so I haven't had an opportunity to look at that yet. I know that there have been some good people working, and that is really the streamlining of the regulatory process. I know that when that draft is completed — and I have asked the officials to make sure that I have a chance to meet with the chair from YESAB.

I have had a couple of meetings over the last month with the chair of the Water Board, so there has been an opportunity — and I went to speak with the Water Board and to their officials just a couple of weeks ago, and we chatted about what is going to be required. So, the Water Board has come back to the Yukon government, and they have some things that they think — some tools — that they want some support with that can help them. I think it's important to note that, when you talk about the time frame, we are also seeing the complexity of applications over the last number of years continue to grow.

The magnitude of information that is coming in from interventions, from either other levels of government or from other organizations, is seeming to be incredibly complex compared to what it was just a number of years ago. That is what is being conveyed at least by the leadership from the Water Board to us.

I would think that, based on what we were seeing in Energy, Mines and Resources on the permitting process — looking at, you know, a class 3 mining permit and thinking that this is the same sort of impact that is happening both at the Water Board and YESAB as Energy, Mines and Resources was experiencing — you were seeing again the complexity and magnitude of response during the consultation period to permitting and to assessment becoming increasingly, again, as I said, complex and significant.

So, I know that is leading to more time for folks to get to those appropriate decisions.

I think it's that work that's difficult to speed through if you're going to do it right. I think that's the other piece when you talk about the regulatory process. I mean, a lot of this is coming down twofold: one, the interest and motivation to get land planning done throughout Yukon and going through those processes and the other being the mining legislation.

I don't know if the member opposite — I assume this was the stakeholder — not stakeholder but the list of governments, I should say, some — we bring — organizations are coming as stakeholders but as well government officials. I think there are 23 nations now at the table on our mining legislation work. Again, that's significant.

There is an obligation to ensure that all of the transboundary nations as well as our 14 nations in the Yukon are having an opportunity to work through that. That as well is substantial work and important work, but there is good progress being made.

So, I'm looking forward, and I will be able to report back to the member opposite once I see the final version of the work on streamlining of the regulatory assessment process. I know our expectation is that we see that work by the federal government. There was a commitment to do that work, and we in Yukon had to get those initial foundational pieces done, which was to get support with First Nation governments and to get appropriate language in. Now we'll see what language they are going to use and, of course, as we stated, what the next period of conversation will look like with the public and with Water Board.

Our team right now is just going through their requests and their requests are twofold. It's about policy development, trying to make sure that they can define in the new reality Water Board how to appropriately go through the decision-making matrix with the right policy tools at their hands. As well, the work that we touched on — and I think in the briefing you would have seen the key legal work that they're doing around the challenge from Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation versus the water licence that Canada has in place — it's not a private sector or Yukon government — at Mount Nansen.

There is some work underway and some work completed, and we're continuing to look forward to the next set of recommendations that we have on the streamlining report.

Mr. Kent: As I mentioned, I think the big concern that we're hearing from industry is the almost 200 water licences that will be up for renewal in the next three years. I think that's the big concern we're having. I understand that there is a process going on right now to rewrite the legislation — the *Placer Mining Act* and the *Quartz Mining Act* — but I think the immediate concern is what's going to happen next year to an already stressed system where, as I mentioned, in placer, the average in YESAB is 146 days and then you're anywhere from four to 18 months in the Water Board process. It's obviously causing a lot of distress for some of the operating placer mines.

The minister mentioned a couple of things. He said that the Water Board is proposing some new tools to the government. They have some idea of what they can do. Are those tools designed to alleviate some of the pressures that are coming up with these water licence renewals for the placer sector? The minister also mentioned some new rules coming in for the YESAA process. I am curious if he can elaborate on exactly what those are for us.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I am happy to clarify. Yes, the discussion with the Water Board is similar to the discussion that we're having now. It was about the significant number of applications that they are about to see and, to be fair, about the significant amount of work that they have in front of them right now.

Part of that request and work with us is to look at just an ability to define their policy work so that they can move quicker through a bulk of applications. Yes, that is accurate. If we come back with any sort of legislative response on that, I can delineate that a little bit better.

The other question — and I just want to clarify. Maybe I misunderstood, but new rules for YESAA — no. I discussed the work on the YESAA legislation, but maybe I will get the member opposite just to clarify, because I want to make sure that this is very clear today.

Mr. Kent: It is something that the minister mentioned earlier on today — that there was some — and I jotted it down quickly; perhaps I didn't hear correctly. But he said that there were some new rules coming in with respect to YESAA next year or the year after, so I am curious if he has anything that he can expand on — what those rules are and if they will they affect timelines for projects,

Hon. Mr. Pillai: No, what I was referring to — not new rules. There is a significant number of applications in 2025, 2026, 2027. It refers back to that period of time when there was a bulk of applications that came in just before the legislation — about 20 years ago. If you look at the timeline of those, I think that they are 10-year — I don't think they are 20-year — and many of them are land permits. They will be coming back through the process, so we have been flagging that as well to say: You have a substantial amount of activity coming through both — coming at you when it comes to YESAB as well as to the Water Board.

I will say to the member opposite that, when it comes to placer, a number of placer miners have talked to me about this directly and flagged the fact that they have concern going into next spring around their water licences, and I have conveyed that directly to the chair of the Water Board — and with the federal government as well — to say that there is incredible pressure on that system when it comes to YESAB as well.

We want to make sure that we have the appropriate number of folks on the Water Board. We have seen a little bit of movement. We have been waiting for a federal appointment as well, because that is important — the different panels, of course — and then you have to have your quorum and that is a significant amount of activity for those members who are then doing some of the panel work and the same for YESAB.

So, I will just say for the House that the pressure — and the significance of the pressure and future pressure — is something that we are conveying very clearly to both organizations.

Mr. Kent: I appreciate that. I'm sure we'll follow up with the minister as we get into the spring when a number of these renewals are coming up and are making their way through the system.

I did have a couple of other questions here. In the minister's mandate letter, it says that it is going to research — Executive Council Office is leading this with support from Finance and EMR — potential models to establish a made-in-Yukon carbon-credit program. So, I'm looking for some details around that and when we can expect to see some of that work completed.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: The beginning work was really about doing the due diligence around a carbon-credit type of program in the Yukon or to look at what the opportunities were in that discussion. Work was done by the department. The real challenge is that, in the Yukon, you have a tremendous amount of land that has been conserved already and, likely going through the future steps of land use planning, you will see other lands conserved. The difficulty is that, because that land is being left in an intact state when it goes through a land planning process, for example, or a sub-regional planning process or a local area planning process, it's not net new; it's existing lands that are left intact.

So, as I understand it — and I've had some chance to go through some of the work that was done and the due diligence — the difficulty is that the view globally is that if you're going in and transitioning something from a current state and you're adding net new to help with offsets, then you're in a position where you can monetize that in some form.

There is not an element right now to be able to look — whether it be for nations, whether it be for the Yukon government, whether it be for NGOs, private sector, or whomever it may be — at that exchange and to monetize or to trade as it is in the States.

So, we're just watching when that conversation is going to happen globally and if there is going to be an ability in the future for organizations to come in and do an assessment of lands that are being protected — and not only the natural net positives of that but also: Can that be seen as an opportunity

within existing mechanisms or some sort of a hybrid of the existing framework that exists? It requires net new offsets; that is the key. That is what was learned, but it was something that we dug into at the department level right away. As the member opposite stated, it was in the mandate letter, and really, it's about looking for the conversation to change at a global level, as we see it, before there is a significant opportunity.

Maybe if there were significant forestry in some areas and there is reforestation or things such as that in the future, maybe with remediation and reclamation through significant mining disturbance, then we can go back and look at that. But just going through the conservation of natural habitat and natural lands, there wouldn't be a role or an opportunity at this particular time.

Mr. Kent: The next bullet point in the mandate letter is: to work with the private sector and stakeholders to identify challenges in government processes and establish a business navigation system. I'm hoping that the minister can explain what the business navigation system is and if it has indeed been established yet and, if not, what the timing is to do that.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Yes, this work is ongoing. I believe that right now — just briefing — getting ready for this fall session, I have been made aware that it's at the deputy ministers level just moving through work with, I think, a number of departments besides Executive Council. Twofold — I had a discussion with the Deputy Minister of the Executive Council, but I think it's something else that we are tasking some of our new team with as well to look at through Economic Development.

The time frame that I'm looking at right now to make sure that I have tools available is getting into the spring, because I have been trying to make sure that there are a lot of discussions with the private sector and understanding ways to navigate, really, some of the bureaucracy and red tape that the private sector experiences coming to government.

That is some of the work that I want to see done. What it initially was — I can give two examples: an organization or private sector business that has to see an inspector, and there might be two or three different inspectors from the Yukon government who they actually have to meet with. So, just moving it to be in a position where those inspection offices can try to coordinate collectively so that the private sector individual is not taking maybe three separate days to have that discussion. At the same time, it's making sure that the inspectors have an opportunity to come together collectively, and maybe that helps with transportation or some of the logistics in navigation. That is one example of what the thoughts were.

The second is making sure that folks — I had a call today from a multi-level organization looking at recreation, looking at energy, and looking at non-profit work collectively — coming together and saying, you know: We've had some really good conversations with government; we think that there is some support in a couple of areas, but we think it's broader than that. In this particular case, in discussion, it's: Please provide me with a page and a half on what they're talking about. This seems to be a compelling proposal that's being put in front;

there are a lot of great Yukon organizations involved, but let me make sure that the officials can take a look at that.

So, how you ensure that there's a way so that it's not only our office that is listening to it, but there's a way for a navigator to potentially meet with them and help them identify the different areas within government departments that can support them — that's the concept that we're looking at for the navigator or that navigation work.

Mr. Kent: I just have a couple of other topics I wanted to touch on. The first is that I know that there is \$120,000 in the supplementary for costs associated with renewal of the licence of the Whitehorse Rapids generating station. The current water licence for the station expires in May 2025 and a renewal application is to be submitted in November. Does that have to be submitted to YESAB and then the Water Board, or has it already gone through the YESAA process? Is the minister concerned, as probably a lot of Yukoners are, with the amount of time it may take to get through the YESAA process and the Water Board process before the expiration of the licence in May of next year?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I will start by answering the last part of the question. I am keenly watching the timelines would be how I would respond to that. I think that there is a process, and it does have to go through YESAB, and it has to go to the Water Board. I am going to commend our officials; they have been doing a tremendous amount of work. First of all, you have Yukon Energy Corporation submitting and doing the key work. I know that, in our discussions with Yukon Energy, part of the conversation was the magnitude of information requests. When it was submitted to YESAB, there was a lot of work that had to be put together, and it was a larger information request I believe than what was ever contemplated before from Yukon Energy Corporation.

I also think that there was a lot of good work done between Aboriginal Relations on a government-to-government basis as well with both Ta'an Kwäch'än Council and Kwanlin Dün First Nation. There seems to be some good support there from both nations as we go into the process. We are going to watch that. I think that right now everybody is aware of the sensitivity on the timelines; it is going through YESAB, but at the same time, I know that the Water Board is aware of tight timelines there.

Yes, that is the key work as we go through this process. Of course, these applications are becoming incredibly complex compared to what we have seen in the past.

Mr. Kent: Just to clarify then, it is already submitted to YESAB but needs to go to the Water Board yet, or is it still — this November's submission — is that going to be to the Water Board?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Yes, my understanding from speaking with officials is that it has been submitted to YESAB, but it then will have to go to the Water Board upon the completion of a decision.

Mr. Kent: The last topic I wanted to touch on is in the statistics branch, which I understand is under the Executive Council Office. In their monthly analysis — and I have been watching this trend for the past number of months just kind of hoping that it would go down, because in prior months and prior

years, the difference wasn't so much, and that is with respect to the food prices between the Yukon, Alberta, and BC. The most recent stats in August have this select basket of foods at 23.7 percent higher than Alberta and 21 percent higher than BC. I'm just curious if the minister or any of his colleagues — perhaps I could ask someone else in Cabinet — have done any analysis of this and why the trends have been rising and staying at this low-20s mark for the last year or so and sort of when they started to bump up to those rates. That will be my final question.

I just want to thank the officials, and then I can turn it over to the Member for Takhini-Kopper King if she has any questions.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: The stats branch works directly in the Finance department — that's okay. I'll be prepared to come back to speak to that, because I try to make sure that every — that all of the statistical information that is being released — weekly, monthly, quarterly, biannually, annually — that I'm going through it all, and I want to be open — that's something that I do have to and want to take a look at. I have been, of course — the member opposite probably, as well — if you're watching this statistical data coming from inflation — inflation, of course — our numbers have been very good. Comparably, if you look at the Canadian average — if you look at many larger provinces, even in southern Canada that are seeing more inflation in their numbers, even if they have used some cost-cutting measures around some of the things you have seen — reducing certain taxes on different elements of everyday life. Even in those cases, they have had inflation grow greater than ours.

I will go back to specifically look at the stats on the basket of foods and the comparables, and then, if we want to have this discussion later in the fall, I'm happy to do so.

Ms. White: Of course, welcome to the officials, and I thank my colleague for the scope of questions that he has asked.

Within the Executive Council Office, is this where — for example, when deputy ministers choose to leave government, is this the place where there would be an opportunity for an exit interview?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: The officials are sharing with me that there is not a long history of exit interviews with deputy ministers. So, of course, if there is an opportunity and there is an interest to do that, but what we just asked is — I just asked as well — to ensure that we have a sense of what the Public Service Commissioner thinks is the most appropriate, of course. I believe, for negotiation on terms of contract, that's all done through the Public Service Commission, and there is an independence with that organization that can help probably garner information like that in a more comfortable and independent way.

Ms. White: I do appreciate the answer. One of the reasons why I am particularly asking the Premier in this case is that my understanding is that the Executive Council Office is — like, if we were looking at a pyramid, it's kind of like at the top of that pyramid when we talk about the public service — and then understanding that deputy minister positions are politically appointed. So, there are differences between that, for

example, and the ADM level, not to say that deputy ministers aren't merit-based, because 100 percent, they know lots of stuff and they're very good, and I was just more interested in understanding.

So, if we see trends within the leadership of the public service, I guess my question that I am trying to get a sense of is: How do we find out if there is — of course, there will be individual decisions that people make but if there are some similarities in those decisions —

So, understanding that the Premier has just said that is something that would lean more toward the public service, but is that something that he has ever considered in the terms of understanding that the Executive Council Office is — my understanding is that deputy ministers kind of report in that way, but I could definitely not understand that, so if he could walk me through how that hierarchy of deputy ministers work, I could go from there.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: It's important to note that the deputy ministers who are hired through the Yukon government are, of course, incredibly talented public servants. In some cases, what you've seen with the Public Service Commissioner is someone who is incredibly talented but is coming from a different set of experiences into their role. I think I want to take the opportunity to just quickly say that I don't believe that there has been this many deputy ministers who have found their full education through the elementary school system and high school system in the Yukon. Yukoners who were born in the Yukon and have, maybe in some cases, done post-secondary Outside and then come back — there's an incredible group of people in those roles, and you know that we have fluctuated pretty much with gender parity in those roles over the last year or two. I think that is also incredibly important.

I would just state that the Deputy Minister of Executive Council Office certainly has a leadership role among deputy ministers, and that plays out normally, from my understanding, in two or three ways. The first would be bringing folks together to ensure that mandates are delivered and to define policy positions from Cabinet. That can be done in either a formal or informal way. I think that it has been general practice that, usually once a week, deputy ministers come together in an informal — but, of course, there are formal — role.

The second would be ensuring that there is support individually at a bilateral level between the Deputy Minister of Executive Council Office and another deputy minister or president of a corporation or somebody in a similar position. That's really just about supporting those individuals in their capacity development or maybe through government processes or just supporting them in their daily work.

I would say that the third piece would be when there has to be a central voice. Going through the pandemic, this would probably be key. I think you would have seen — although Community Services making sure that regulations were put in place, Department of Health and Social Services responding to that, and also standing up other entities. Of course, the Deputy Minister of Executive Council Office would have played a key role in ensuring that there was a navigation.

In my role, I am reaching out when I am needing to speak to departments in a sense that I am trying to find out a piece of information on either some work that we are doing or coming into the House or to answer a question — I am going to reach out to the Deputy Minister of Executive Council Office and then let him reach out to his colleagues if I am looking for something that maybe another member in the Assembly wants to ask me.

I think I would just leave it at that. That is really how it functions collectively through the public service.

Ms. White: I thank the Premier and I appreciate that again. I am in the unique position to have been elected for 13 years and not actually ever sat on that side of the room, so sometimes, it is like getting the curtain drawn back. You just have to ask the question to figure out how it works, so I do appreciate that.

Just getting to the supplementary budget, can the minister please just break down the \$1,231,000 increase in First Nation capacity funding for me? It says it is funding for consultation and engagement, bilateral negotiations, and meeting final and self-government agreement obligations.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: There is an increase for First Nation capacity funding for consultation, engagement, bilateral negotiations, implementation of final and self-government agreements, and ongoing intergovernmental relationships with Yukon and transboundary First Nation governments with comprehensive land claim agreements. That is the \$1,231,000. I think that was really the breakdown there.

I can touch on some of it. I think that this conversation has happened in here. The member opposite would have heard this probably for the last 13 years, and really, it comes down to that there are a lot of confidential agreements on a bilateral level but again discussions with First Nation governments on a number of issues and address government-to-government discussions.

Some of it is capacity, for instance, within a First Nation. Maybe it's a lands department; it also could be funds that we are using with a First Nation when it comes to providing them with funding to respond to a consultation. When you think about all of the work that we have going on broadly right now, you would have the work that is being done on new legislation for mining legislation, and you would have just some general work that we do with some nations on supporting certain departments inside their government, especially when you are working through specific key items. Maybe it's work on fish and wildlife; it could be responding to a project if there is a project happening in a particular area and they are looking for support. There is a lot of different work. Generally, that money is spread out throughout almost every — going through this — First Nation in the Yukon is — in some way or form — that some of those funds are being used to support.

Ms. White: I thank the Premier for that. In just referencing my notes from the August 15 briefing — and I 100 percent expect to be corrected because I'm not going to lie; my notetaking sometimes has lots of arrows and circled things, and I have to try to follow my own arrows.

As an example, I think I was told that the pocket of money was \$500,000. It was about the Whitehorse Rapids generation.

It was going to CTFN, KDFN, Ta'an Kwäch'än, and Champagne and Aishihik. Can the minister help me to understand what this square that I wrote in my notes from August 15 — can he decipher that for me?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: As stated, that would not be correct based on the comments that were just made by the member opposite, so I would leave it at that. I would hope that officials didn't get into defining and disseminating dollar values on any of those agreements. Certainly, what was just stated in the House now is not accurate.

Ms. White: Then for further clarification, can the minister tell me if there was financial support to the Carcross/Tagish First Nation, Kwanlin Dün First Nation, Ta'an Kwäch'än Council, and Champagne and Aishihik First Nations to deal with the Whitehorse Rapids generation process?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I believe there has been an ongoing discussion from Yukon Energy Corporation in agreement, but I think it probably pertains to the work between Carcross/Tagish, Kwanlin Dün First Nation, and Ta'an Kwäch'än Council. I don't think Champagne and Aishihik First Nations would be part of the discussions on Whitehorse Rapids. Unless I missed something, I don't think so.

Concerning the work that was done through Aboriginal Relations and government to government, I know that we certainly were looking at different ways to support Carcross/Tagish, Kwanlin Dün, and Ta'an Kwäch'än Council.

Ms. White: I thank the Premier for that clarification.

I also have written down \$500,000 for the Liard First Nation, and 25 percent of that is for negotiations and 75 percent of that, I was told, was for the land offices. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I know that there is a breakdown for negotiation and some for support as well, and I think, reflecting on some of the questions that were asked in the briefing — I know the official shared that — I would again have to go back and look at exact amounts. It's not our practice to share exact amounts for some of these bilateral agreements, but I will have to go back and take a look.

I know that we have supported the lands office with a number of nations over the last while — and I think more specifically nations that would not be receiving FTA funding within their bilateral agreements with Canada.

Ms. White: I'll just highlight that I certainly don't have the background or the smarts necessarily to make up the numbers or what the division was, so I'm sure it was a discussion that we had on October 15. But it's fine; I'll move on to other things, but those were notes that I did take on October 15.

I probably don't have much more to ask, so I will leave it at that, and I will endeavour to do a better job taking notes at the spring briefing.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I thank the members opposite, and I just want to thank Deputy Minister Ferbey. I also want to just thank Exilda for all her help. I really appreciate all the preparation and work that you do when we were getting ready for the fall and as we get ready for the mains. It's incredible work. Again, thank you to everybody in the Executive Council Office for the work that they do.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Vote 2, Executive Council Office?

Seeing none, we will proceed to line-by-line debate.

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 2, Executive Council Office, cleared or carried, as required.

Unanimous consent re deeming all lines in Vote 2, Executive Council Office, cleared or carried

Chair: The Member for Takhini-Kopper King has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 2, Executive Council Office, cleared or carried, as required.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures
Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$2,476,000 agreed to
On Capital Expenditures
Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of nil agreed to
Total Expenditures in the amount of \$2,476,000 agreed to
Executive Council Office agreed to

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Madam Chair, I move that you report progress.

Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Mount Lorne-Southern Lakes that the Chair report progress.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Streicker: 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. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*, 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: Mr. Speaker, 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 5:24 p.m.

The following sessional papers were tabled October 28, 2024:

35-1-171

Final Report — Yukon Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform — October 2024 (Speaker Harper)

35-1-172

Annual Report 2023-2024 — Yukon Teachers Labour Relations Board (Silver)

35-1-173

Annual Report 2023-2024 — Yukon Public Service Labour Relations Board (Silver)

35-1-174

Bill No. 44, *Traffic Safety Act*, reprinted with amendments (Clarke, N.)