



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 214

1st Session

35th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, November 5, 2024 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Jeremy Harper

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2024 Fall Sitting

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

CABINET MINISTERS

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

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Yukon Party

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

THIRD PARTY

New Democratic Party

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

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, November 5, 2024 — 1:00 p.m.

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

Prayers

Speaker's statement

Speaker: Yesterday, the Minister responsible for the Women and Gender Equity Directorate gave notice of a motion, Motion No. 1091. This motion does not conform to Standing Order 29(1). Therefore, it is not in order and has not been placed on the Notice Paper.

I would like to remind all members that the rubric Notices of Motions in the Daily Routine should not be used to make member statements.

DAILY ROUTINE

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Speaker: Introduction of visitors.
Visitors introduced

Speaker: Are there any tributes?

TRIBUTES

In recognition of Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council 50th anniversary

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our Yukon Liberal government to pay tribute to the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council in recognition of their 50th anniversary this week.

Since 1974, YAWC has been supporting leadership and advancement for Indigenous women, girls, and gender-diverse people in the Yukon and northern British Columbia. Before I speak about the amazing work that YAWC has been a part of, I want to recognize its founding members, 10 incredible women who met at Skookum Jim Friendship Centre in January 1974. Those women were: Lorraine Joe, Margaret Joe, Francis Woolsey, Josephine Muff, Patt Delaney, Cathy Rear, Pat Martin, Maxine Grant, Emma Kaushee Harris, and Edi Bohmer.

It is not possible to mention in one short speech all the remarkable people who have been a part of YAWC and all of the impacts that they have made over five decades, so here are just a few highlights and notable figures.

In 1980, several members travelled to Ottawa to protest the removal of an Indigenous woman's legal Indian status if she married a non-Indigenous man. One of the women who participated in the 1980 lobbying effort was Brenda Sam, who would go on to become elected to council and eventually become Chief of the Ta'an Kwäch'än Council.

Margaret Commodore, or Joe, another of the early members, became the first Indigenous woman in Canada to be a minister of justice.

Kaushee Harris was the first president of the Yukon Indian Women's Association and worked hard to establish a safe place for women and children in distress. In 1980, a year after her death, the first women's transition home opened in Whitehorse. It was named Kaushee's Place in her honour.

Margaret Thompson was an early member of the organization who went on to become the president of the Native Women's Association of Canada, affecting policy and change for Indigenous women nationwide.

Alice McGuire was a former member of YAWC who went on to become the first Yukon First Nation female Member of the Yukon Legislative Assembly in 1978.

I want to also extend my thanks to all of the current and past staff and board of director members, including the current president, Terri Szabo, whom I have worked alongside as a member of the Yukon Advisory Committee on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls and Two-spirit+ People. Because of the work and the dedication of the staff, the impressive portfolio of YAWC now expands across several fields, including research, advocacy, community outreach, and personal and professional development. Their programs promote and model decolonization, healing from trauma, cultural protection, and assembly in support of reconciliation and self-determination for and of Indigenous women, girls, and gender-diverse people.

I absolutely hold my hands up to the many women who have contributed to this work, those who continue to do the work today, and for those yet to come.

Applause

Ms. Van Bibber: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to congratulate the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council on their 50th anniversary.

The YAWC works to empower and promote the rights and well-being of Indigenous women, girls, and gender-diverse people throughout Yukon and northern BC. As I wrote this, I wanted to let the listeners know that I wrote this in the language of the times of the 1970s and 1980s — what a legacy.

On January 21, 1974, a strong group of well-known women gathered to form the Yukon Indian Women's Association. The mandate was to advocate on current issues related to marginalized women in our north. One of their early actions — immense pressure on the federal government to remove the clauses in the *Indian Act* that caused an Indian woman to lose her status should she marry a non-Indian man — to change the equality rights of Indian women under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. A trip to Ottawa in 1980 and the work that followed, along with others across Canada, led to Bill C-31 in 1985. Many lost women and their children regained their status. Equally important, a non-Indian woman could no longer get Indian status by marrying an Indian man. It was a major milestone.

The council led numbers of initiatives and events throughout the years. Issues such as gender-based violence

remains a key focus, addressing root causes and fostering change so that their clients can thrive with new coping mechanisms. They provide funding for learning new skills and have an employment strategy program to help build resumé to enable and maintain employment.

Many events hold important significance each year in our communities: Sisters in Spirit Walk, missing and murdered Indigenous women initiatives, the Red Dress Campaign, Sally and Sisters lunch program, and much, much more. They also did a taxi safety campaign so that we could all feel safe in our communities and to learn how to report harassment and offences when taking a taxi.

They speak for those who live in poverty, for the homeless, for those who have health issues, ageism, elder abuse, and in recent years, with a focus on missing and murdered Indigenous women. These are some of the issues that the council continues to address. Not one of these are light topics, but we applaud all who continue to focus on the positive and make inroads big and small for women, girls, and gender-diverse people.

I firmly believe that if you want to change something, get involved. So, bless those women who also believed this 50 years ago. We are better for their work — and a shout-out to the board, elders, councillors, and all the volunteers past and present. Well done and thank you for all you do.

Applause

MLA Tredger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon NDP to celebrate the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council on their 50th anniversary. I want to thank the Member for Mountainview and the Member for Porter Creek North for the story and history they shared. It was a real treat to hear the history of this organization and hear about some of the people who have been part of it.

Fifty years is such a remarkable achievement. For 50 years, the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council has been supporting the leadership and advancement for and by Indigenous women, girls, and gender-diverse people in the Yukon and northern BC. In those 50 years, there have been monumental shifts in politics, society, and even the environment. Through it all, this organization has grown and adapted while they do their critical work. So much has changed, but this organization is as important today as it was 50 years ago.

None of that happens without an enormous amount of work by people like the ones in the gallery today. Success like that is the result of time, energy, passion, and dedication. I want to thank all the many, many people who have made the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council the success that it is and continues to be.

Thank you to the board members, the staff, the volunteers, and the members past and present. Your work is so valued and appreciated. Because of you, the Yukon is a better place. We look forward to seeing the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council continue to thrive long into the future. Congratulations on this milestone.

Applause

In recognition of National Francophone Immigration Week

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Monsieur le Président, je prends la parole aujourd'hui au nom du gouvernement libéral du Yukon à l'occasion de la 12^e édition de la Semaine nationale de l'immigration francophone. Chaque année au mois de novembre, cette semaine est l'occasion de souligner les importantes contributions des immigrants et immigrantes francophones au Yukon.

Le thème de cette année, "Notre héritage de demain", est une invitation à découvrir l'héritage des personnes de tous les horizons qui composent les communautés francophones et acadiennes du Canada.

Ici, au Yukon, nous avons de nombreuses raisons de célébrer. Que ce soit par leur cuisine, leur musique, leur art ou leurs nombreuses contributions à notre économie florissante, les immigrants et immigrantes francophones contribuent à la diversité de notre territoire — et du Canada — qui enrichit notre vie quotidienne.

Par l'offre de services d'aide à l'établissement, l'organisation d'activités de réseautage et bien plus depuis plusieurs décennies, des organismes communautaires comme l'Association franco-yukonnaise ont contribué à ce que les nouveaux arrivants et nouvelles arrivantes francophones se sentent soutenus et accueillis.

En 2019, Whitehorse a été choisie pour faire partie des 14 collectivités canadiennes qui ont pris part à l'Initiative des communautés francophones accueillantes du gouvernement fédéral. Ce choix met en relief le potentiel de la ville à être encore plus inclusive et accueillante pour les nouveaux arrivants et nouvelles arrivantes francophones. Il aide également des partenaires locaux à soutenir l'intégration et la rétention des nouveaux arrivants et des nouvelles arrivantes francophones. L'adoption d'une approche par la communauté francophone pour la communauté francophone a grandement favorisé la vitalité de cette communauté au Yukon. Les efforts déployés sont appuyés par plusieurs services offerts en français, notamment l'éducation, le soutien à l'emploi, la formation et des services dans des programmes gouvernementaux clés.

Il n'est pas étonnant que le Yukon soit une destination prisée des francophones qui immigreront au Canada. Nous pouvons en être fiers, surtout si on considère que plus de 14 % de la population du Yukon parle français, ce qui fait de notre territoire la troisième administration la plus bilingue au Canada après le Québec et le Nouveau-Brunswick.

Le Yukon est la seule administration canadienne où le nombre de personnes qui parlent principalement le français à la maison est en hausse. C'est en partie grâce à l'immigration francophone. Selon le dernier recensement, 10 % des immigrants et immigrantes qui viennent au Yukon peuvent tenir une conversation en français. Le territoire surpasse donc la cible d'immigration francophone hors Québec établie par le Canada.

Alors, merci Monsieur le Président, et bonne Semaine nationale de l'immigration francophone.

Applause

Ms. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize National Francophone Immigration Week. We celebrate francophone immigration to Canada and the Yukon and those organizations that support their introduction to our territory and integration into our communities — among them, Association franco-yukonnaise, which offers resources in employment and training and assistance in integration for newcomers. Bienvenue to all those who enrich our francophone culture.

This special week is a time for us to honour the vibrant contributions that French-speaking newcomers bring to our communities. By welcoming new voices, we grow our nation. Francophone immigrants play an essential role in enriching our culture, strengthening our economy, and adding new voices to the French language legacy across the country.

Throughout all of Canada, French is the first official language for 22 percent of the population. Yukon is home to the third highest number of francophones, only behind Québec and New Brunswick.

An incredible francophone community calls the Yukon home, and that community is growing year after year.

To all francophone newcomers, we value your unique journeys, your heritage, and the diverse skills that you bring. Whether you are here for work, study, family, or simply seeking new opportunities, know that you are part of a supportive community that celebrates and respects your French heritage. Canada is proud to be a bilingual country, and your presence keeps the French language and culture alive, thriving, and evolving.

I'm an immigrant too. We recognize the courage it takes to start anew in a different place and we're committed to making sure you feel at home.

Francophone Immigration Week is more than just a celebration; it is a reminder that Canada's strength lies in its diversity. Francophones make an impact here in the Yukon. Thank you for choosing Canada as your home and for helping us build a community where everyone can flourish en français.

Thank you as well to AFY and to all other organizations providing assistance to new arrivals within Yukon's French-speaking community.

Merci beaucoup.

Applause

Ms. White: Monsieur le Président, je suis heureux de me lever aujourd'hui au nom du Nouveau Parti démocratique du Yukon pour célébrer la Semaine nationale de l'immigration francophone.

Chaque année, début novembre, cette semaine rassemble des milliers de francophones des quatre coins du pays pour célébrer la richesse de la diversité culturelle et linguistique des communautés francophones au Canada.

La francophonie est une partie importante de la culture canadienne. Je suis ravi de la voir si active et si vivante au Yukon.

En cette Semaine d'immigration francophone, une bienvenue toute spéciale à celles et ceux qui sont nouvelles et nouveaux au Canada et au Yukon, que vous soyez francophone, ou de tous milieux linguistiques.

Nous sommes heureux de vous accueillir parmi nous!

Bonne semaine à toutes et à tous.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today the 2023-24 annual report on the implementation plan for Yukon's missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls and two-spirit+ people strategy, *Changing the Story to Upholding Dignity and Justice*, and also a summary of that report.

Speaker: Are there any further returns or documents for tabling?

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions to be presented?

PETITIONS

Petition No. 27

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling today a petition that reads:

This petition of the undersigned shows:

THAT Section 11 of the Chronic Disease and Disability Benefits Regulations states that "there may be a Chronic Disease and Disability Advisory Committee comprised of two members of the Yukon Medical Association, one pharmacist licensed under the *Pharmacists Act* and the director";

THAT there is not currently such an Advisory Committee, despite the pressing need for one;

THAT there is no mention of patients in this advisory committee, or a role for a patient advisory member on this committee;

THAT the appeal process described in the Chronic Disease and Disability Benefits Regulations is neither clear nor transparent;

THEREFORE, the undersigned ask the Yukon Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Yukon to:

(1) change the wording of Section 11 in the Chronic Disease and Disability Benefits Regulations to read "there shall be a Chronic Disease and Disability Advisory Committee";

(2) change the wording of Section 11 to include a patient with lived experience or a patient-appointed advocate in this Advisory Committee;

(3) Review and adjust the Regulations in order to make the appeals process clear and transparent.

Speaker: Are there any bills to be introduced?
Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

THAT this House congratulates Peter Mather as the winner of the 2024 Banff Mountain Photo Essay Competition for his essay “Mountain Ghosts”.

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

THAT this House recognizes the incredible effort of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the recent dismantling of the largest and most sophisticated drug superlab in Canadian history in Falkland, British Columbia, which will significantly reduce the illegal drug and firearms supply in the Yukon and across Canada.

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

THAT this House supports the Government of Yukon’s modernization of nursing regulations that make it easier for more registered nurses and nurse practitioners to work in the territory.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to conduct a study to determine the cost of living in Old Crow.

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

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Energy supply and demand

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, the defining feature of the Liberals’ energy strategy has been their increasing reliance on rented diesel generators to keep the lights on in the Yukon. In their first term, they cancelled the planned thermogeneration facility in Whitehorse that was desperately needed because they said they didn’t want to invest in energy generation that was powered by fossil fuels. At the time, the now Premier said that this was good news for Yukoners and that Yukoners — quote: “... question the value of making capital investments in the burning of fossil fuels...”

He also said that he thought that renting instead of owning was a good investment; however, since then, they have consistently relied on renting diesel generators by the dozens to fill the growing dependable capacity gap, which last we heard was approaching 40 megawatts.

Can the Premier tell us if he still thinks that renting instead of owning generation capacity is a good investment?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, by the way, what we were talking about was what Yukoners asked us for. They want us to move to renewable energy overall. They understand completely that we need fossil fuels, like diesel generators, as

backup. As the territory grows — and it has been growing — and as our economy has been expanding — and it has been expanding — then what they want us to do is to invest in renewables for primary electricity generation. We will continue to do that. We will continue as well to have fossil fuels as backup to make sure that our system is reliable and dependable.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, in the past year, reality has hit home for this Liberal government. Almost all major renewable projects that they have been banking on have either failed or are failing. Meanwhile, our demand is growing rapidly, so we have reached the stage where Yukon Energy is struggling to literally keep the lights on, and now the Liberals are turning to major expansions of their fossil-fuel infrastructure. Currently before the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board, the Yukon Energy Corporation has multiple projects that will massively expand our reliance on fossil fuels. In each of Faro, Mayo, and Dawson, the Liberals are proposing to massively expand diesel generating plants.

So, can the Minister of Energy tell us how the massive expansion of the diesel plants in Faro, Mayo, and Dawson fits with his promise to never lock the Yukon into a fossil-fuel future?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, some of those ones that the member opposite is talking about are replacing old diesels, so we are just replacing them because we need a system that is reliable. If there is one thing that changed this year around our ability to produce renewable energy, it is the fact that we didn’t have enough rainfall in Aishihik to recharge that facility. It was at 35 percent of its normal levels, and so that means that we will need to use more diesel in order to make sure that we have electricity for Yukoners this winter.

However, the effects that are happening in Aishihik are exactly related to the variability in precipitation that comes with climate change, which — I will just remind the Yukon Party — is why we are working to get more renewables overall. That is what we heard from Yukoners, so we will continue to do that. I know that the Yukon Party believes that we should just build diesel plants and be done with it, but I think that is the wrong approach. We believe, in agreeing with Yukoners, that we want a renewable energy future.

Mr. Kent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has made some pretty big statements about how the Liberal government would never invest in fossil-fuel generation capacity. He said that only the Yukon Party would ever consider a thermal plant, and he said that the Liberals would never want to lock us into a fossil-fuel future. Yet as we speak, there are multiple projects before YESAB that will massively expand the diesel plants in at least three communities. In Faro, they are adding almost five megawatts of new diesel generation. In Mayo, they are adding over four megawatts of new diesel generation, and in Dawson City, they are planning to build a whopping 15.5 megawatts of diesel generation.

So, how can the minister describe these investments as anything but hypocrisy?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: You know — sorry, but I think the Yukon Party is hypocritical. They said in their — I have it right

here; yes, here it is. They said in their platform that they were going to adjust a made-in-Yukon carbon pricing system, but now they say that, no, they don't want that. In fact, they brought a motion to that effect.

I won't have enough time to get into it right here, but if we take Beaver Creek and Burwash, if we take Watson Lake, if we take Old Crow — if we take all these communities where we are investing in renewables — the members opposite just fail to acknowledge that, right down the street here, we had to close down the one building with the diesels, and we're distributing them around the territory. This is called "backup".

No, for primary generation, we believe that we should invest in renewables. We think it's the right approach; Yukoners are telling us it's the right approach.

Question re: Public Accounts

Mr. Dixon: Mr. Speaker, speaking of hypocrisy, last week, the Minister of Finance made a number of comments about his government's record on debt. While the Public Accounts show a massive increase in total debt, the Minister of Finance told the Legislature that it was only short-term debt. He said that the Liberals were — quote: "... 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..."

Yet just a few days after saying that in the Legislature, we learned in a letter from the minister of energy that they are taking on over \$27 million in long-term borrowing to finance the construction of a massive new diesel plant in Dawson City.

So, how can the Minister of Finance explain the discrepancy between his comments about long-term debt and his government's actions?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, so, when Yukon Energy goes to the Utilities Board, they get direction from the Utilities Board that they should have a ratio of debt to equity. So, whenever we are investing in upgrading our system, in modernizing our energy generation system and making sure that our system is reliable for Yukoners, investing in our renewable electricity system and the ability to have backup, that takes that investment. That is what the \$27 million is for. This is just a significant investment that is by the book as per the Yukon Utilities Board instructions. So, it's about the debt-to-equity ratio.

I think I put in answers for the member opposite.

Anyway, I think I gave a legislative return on this. I'll check to make sure that I supplied — there were questions that came on Yukon Energy early this Sitting. I will check to make sure that I have provided that information for the members opposite.

Mr. Dixon: Well, the minister is right about one thing: It is indeed a massive investment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance was very clear earlier this week. He told both the Legislature and the media that the Liberal's policy was to avoid any long-term debt, because he said it would be a burden to future Yukoners. He said that clearly in the Legislature, and here's what he said to the media

— quote: "It has been our approach to avoid any significant long term borrowing."

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Finance not think that borrowing \$27 million to build a massive new diesel plant in Dawson is significant? How can the minister explain what he said last week considering what his government has actually done?

Hon. Mr. Silver: The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was very clear in the differences between investing and backup and also the suite of renewable investments that we have made in the energy field in Yukon, but the Yukon Party just stays to their own narrative, including with my statements as well.

Look, we're having conversations about borrowing to date. We have also acknowledged that, in order to meet the changing needs of our growing territory, we will have to work closely with our federal partners to secure the money that we need to make sure that we have the ability to invest in assets moving forward.

Again, in the scrums talking about previous debts, I would compare our ability to short-term finance compared to the Yukon Party's long-term investments, in which the principal is not being paid back until 2040, anytime.

Mr. Dixon: Well, the \$27 million that the minister is borrowing to invest in diesel is indeed long-term borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, I think what Yukoners see in this is a double serving of hypocrisy. For years, the Liberals have told us that they would never invest in fossil-fuel generation because it would lock us into a fossil-fuel future.

Last week, the Minister of Finance — and today — told us, Yukoners, that they would avoid any long-term borrowing or debt because it would saddle Yukoners with future costs. Well, just days after the Minister of Finance said that, we learned that in the past few weeks the Liberals have tacked on an extra \$27 million in long-term debt. And what are they borrowing for? A 15.5-megawatt diesel generator in Dawson City.

So, how can the Liberals explain that as anything but rank hypocrisy?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Mr. Speaker, I think there are three things that Yukoners should know. First, the Leader of the Official Opposition stood next to me in the debates going into the last election and committed completely to the renewable plan that his colleague has been criticizing and saying is not something that was good, but it was, just for the record, fully committed to by the Leader of the Official Opposition on the record, who said: We will go out and still build baseload diesel. The blue building that is right next to Yukon Energy — what you will know — when the Yukon Party was in place, was filled with a number of old diesels. They are no longer there. What we have decided to do is replace them with more efficient baseload, and that is what is spread out across the territory.

When I think about bad debt, what I think about is the Member for Lake Laberge structuring — or maybe it was the Official Opposition House Leader who put a \$40-million loan together. So, think about this at the kitchen table: We are borrowing \$40 million; we have no plan to pay it back; we are going to make sure that the loan is for two years, and we are

going to hand it off to other Yukoners. Then, we had to come in and stretch that over 40 years, and that is what Yukoners are paying for. That is how they handled debt; that is what we are talking about.

Question re: Land use planning

Ms. White: Mr. Speaker, the Dawson regional land use planning process first began in 2010 and then restarted again in 2018 and should have been wrapped up long before now. The Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in have been extremely patient in waiting for the minister to respond to the recommended plan. The minister and the nation agreed to a timeline to respond to the plan. The Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in held up their part of that deal, but the government so far has failed to do so and is now months late.

A letter sent to all political parties on October 7 by Hähkè Taylor stated that the nation felt that the Yukon government's behaviour was inconsistent with the letter, the spirit, and the intent of chapter 11 of their final agreement.

While the government stalls, more exploration and development continue to take place on Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in territory, undermining the integrity of the agreement and the planning process. So, when will the government finally provide the response to the recommended Dawson land use plan?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, I did write to Hähkè Taylor recently — I will have to go back and check the date — and let him know that the Minister of Environment and I are working to get our submission in to the Dawson planning commission. I will say that one of those pieces — and I appreciate what Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is saying, that they want to see it get moving, and I agree with them — we do, as well.

It was unfortunate. We were working together at the table seeing if we could find consensus. At the last, we were not able to do that, but just in that moment, Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in gave us another unexpected — I don't know — 70 or 80 recommendations. Those required us to go back and do that due diligence to consider them. Then, we were also — it's our responsibility to go out and consult with other First Nations that overlap the traditional territory about that. That is what took us the time.

We have been very clear. The Premier has spoken with Hähkè Taylor — and I have as well — and let Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in know that we are still completely committed to the plan and that we are working hard to get our submission in.

Ms. White: The minister has mentioned these 80 changes before, but let's be clear: Those changes stem from months of intergovernmental consultation and were first raised in November of 2023. The minister can't keep using them as an excuse for being more than six months late in his reply. Hähkè Taylor and the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in have been clear. They strongly desire to moderate the pace and intensity of mining in their territory. The longer the minister stalls on getting that plan done, the harder it becomes for them to do that, as more land is being staked all the time.

We know that unchecked development in areas of high cultural and environmental value undermines the premise of regional land use planning and the promise of the final agreements. Because of the delays, the nation has asked the

government to grant further interim protections to a number of sensitive areas that they identified in their submission to the commission.

When will the minister grant interim protection for the Stewart River corridor and all the areas identified for protection by the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: First of all, we have already put in interim protection for all of the areas identified by the Dawson planning commission. In fact, we worked ahead of time with the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in. We identified the most sensitive areas and withdrew those. Then the planning commission gave us a draft plan. We withdrew all areas that they sought to identify as draft for protection. We put that protection in place. Then, when the recommended plan came out, they again said: Here are the areas that we think you should protect. And we protected them right away, so that's in place already.

By the way, the senior liaison committee and the technical working group met many, many times. Thank you to everyone from TH, from the Department of Environment, from the Department of Tourism and Culture, Economic Development, and Energy, Mines and Resources who did all this work. It was about no surprises. Everything was supposed to be shared. Then, at the very last, that's when Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in gave us 80 brand-new not discussed, not previously discussed other recommendations. It is something new, and it required effort.

The member opposite can criticize me for not moving fast enough, but really, please, let's not criticize the public servants who have been working so hard in the background. They believe in the plan; they are all working super hard; I think that they have been doing terrific work.

Ms. White: My criticism is always to the ministers. So, there was no answer to granting interim protection for the Stewart River corridor, but I'll leave that open.

Clear and consistent land use plans are for everyone. The Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in want them to help to moderate development on their lands, and miners need them to help clarify where they can mine and ensure that they aren't wasting time and resources on places that they won't be able to mine in the future.

A letter sent from the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in to the three political parties reads — and I quote: "To say that we are frustrated with the lack of progress on this land use plan would be a gross understatement." The lengthy delays are undermining the ability of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in to meaningfully participate in the management of their own lands. Every day that this plan doesn't get done is another day of status quo for the mining industry. It's starting to feel like this is by design.

So, why is this government dragging its heels and delaying the completion of the Dawson regional land use plan?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I know that the question is written before it's read in here on the day, but I did just explain that it was because we got handed more work, and we're going to do that work. As part of that — also as part of how the final agreement is set up — there is our responsibility to engage with other nations around that submission. It's not a light responsibility.

I appreciate that — what I would say for all Yukoners — for all of the people listening out there who care about regional land use planning — that all of the people whom I know of who are working on this land use plan inside the Yukon government, outside the Yukon government, the Yukon Land Use Planning Council — everybody wants this to move forward. It is just the hard work of the public servants who are doing their diligence around this that is taking more time than we want, and we are working to get it there.

I appreciate as well all of the incredibly hard work that the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in has done in their submissions to the planning commission. I'm looking forward to us all getting those together in this next round.

Question re: School busing

Mr. Istchenko: In August, several parents in the Mendenhall subdivision identified some concerns that they had with the Minister of Education regarding the busing schedule for students in the area. They pointed out that students from Mendenhall face over a 90-minute ride to school and almost a two-hour ride home at the end of the day. Naturally, they requested that the minister consider changes to the schedule.

Unfortunately, it does not seem that their request was heard by the minister. So, can the minister explain whether or not she thinks it's acceptable for the students in Mendenhall to spend approximately three and a half hours per day on a school bus?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education provides busing service, city transit passes, and transportation subsidies to families to support students travelling safely and effectively to and from school. As I know the member opposite is well aware, we work with Standard Bus. They hold the contract. We also have a transportation committee. Transportation staff acknowledge the frustration faced by students due to prolonged bus travel times from Mendenhall specifically and the importance for students to arrive at school on time.

Education staff are actively exploring strategies to reduce driving times; however, due to multiple transfers and required stops, significant reductions in commute duration remain challenging. Current schedules indicate that students travelling to St. Francis of Assisi in Riverdale are expected to arrive on time for the start of school. Transportation staff will continue working closely with Standard Bus to ensure that these schedules are upheld and that all children arrive safely and punctually.

Again, we understand the frustration and we're looking at strategies.

Mr. Istchenko: Mr. Speaker, in that letter sent to the minister in August, several parents offered to work with the department to find a solution. They felt that they had offered proactive suggestions and they were told that the department would consider them. They also asked for a meeting urgently to discuss this.

Can the minister tell us if she or her department had such a meeting and, if so, what changes were made as a result?

Hon. Ms. McLean: Mr. Speaker, again, this is a very important aspect of education for our students in the Yukon,

and we take these responsibilities seriously. Our staff at the Department of Education are working closely with all of those involved in the decisions that need to be made. The staff have been working closely with Standard Bus and, of course, communicating closely with families to look at other strategies.

So, yes, of course, our department will continue to work with families and to address the issues that folks have. Again, I'll just reiterate that we are exploring strategies to reduce driving times and look at other options.

Question re: Highways projects

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways and Public Works has talked about a project agreement that was signed in April 2020 to allow construction and resurfacing work to begin on the Robert Campbell Highway between kilometre 354.9 and 414.4. Of course, this is between Ross River and Faro.

Unfortunately, this work has not commenced, and the state of the highway continues to be poor. We hear constant complaints about the lack of maintenance on this section, and with the early arrival of snow this year, this section is even worse than normal.

Can the minister explain to Yukoners why improvements and maintenance on the Robert Campbell Highway between Faro and Ross River are being neglected?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: In April 2020, the project agreement was signed for two projects within the traditional territory of the Ross River Dena Council: highway reconstruction between Ross River and Faro on the Robert Campbell Highway and bridge upgrades and safety improvements on the North Canol Road.

In September 2024, this year, the Yukon government signed a letter of intent with Ross River Dena Council with respect to governance, community health and safety, land and resource management, and economic opportunities. A priority within this agreement is the implementation of the Yukon Resource Gateway program components within the Ross River Dena Council traditional territory. This will ensure that local needs and priorities are integrated into these projects.

Mr. Speaker, officials from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Highways and Public Works have been working with the Ross River Dena Council to determine the next steps of the Robert Campbell Highway project over the summer months.

Currently, a four-kilometre section of this project is designed and permitted. The aim is to tender this piece of work for construction to start next year.

Mr. Hassard: Mr. Speaker, I think we've heard this story before, but unfortunately, Yukoners are still struggling through that section of highway.

Highways and Public Works is also responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of rural airports. We all know the importance of rural airports because of our reliance on air ambulance medevacs in the event of an emergency in our communities.

We have seen pictures recently of the Ross River airstrip that clearly show there that has been too much snow for an air

ambulance to land. Why is the Liberal government not ensuring that rural airstrips are a priority for highway maintenance crews?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I have certainly endeavoured over the course of the last three and a half years to be very responsive when the hard-working MLAs from rural communities bring their concerns to me with respect to road maintenance, vegetation control, and now concerns with respect to the Ross River aerodrome.

Of course, over the course of the last three and a half years, there have been priority aviation infrastructure upgrades which have occurred — most notably, the paving of the Dawson City runway and the maintenance building there. We certainly are keenly aware that aviation infrastructure within the Yukon is incredibly important with respect to medevacs. I endeavour to respond and action matters in a timely fashion. Within the last year or so, the Pelly Crossing aviation infrastructure was regraded as well, and we received great reports from the Selkirk First Nation with respect to the work that had been done there.

So, certainly, road infrastructure and aviation infrastructure within the Yukon are of significant importance to Highways and Public Works, and we endeavour to be responsive on a daily basis.

Question re: Big Creek bridge replacement

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up with the minister about the status of the contract for the Big Creek bridge. When the contract was first awarded, the contractor completed some of the work but then abandoned the project when it was determined that their concrete work was deficient. Since then, the minister has launched a court case against the contractor and has told us that they would recover that money through the bonding company.

Can the minister tell us how much money the government has recovered from the original contractor's bonding company?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity to tell Yukoners about ongoing infrastructure projects that we are completing both in roads and aviation infrastructure and bridges and a redundant fibre infrastructure all across the territory.

Specifically with respect to the Big Creek bridge, it is located approximately 65 kilometres west of Watson Lake on the Alaska Highway and is an important part of Yukon's transportation network. Construction of the new bridge began in 2020. However, due to deficient work, the original contractor was terminated from the project in the spring of 2023. In June this year, the Government of Yukon awarded a contract to Formula Contractors to complete the remaining road and bridge remediation work. Following the completion of the project, we will be working to recoup the cost of fixing the deficient work from the original contractor.

I can happily report that on October 5, 2024, the bridge opened to traffic after successful completion of the repairs of the deficient work. Through the remainder of October, the contractor has completed the construction of the new road alignment and installed the new guardrail for bridge approaches.

The contract is now advancing work to demolish the old bridge in this fiscal year. During the next construction season, the contractor will complete paving of the highway approaches on each side of the bridge.

Ms. McLeod: Mr. Speaker, the original contract for the construction of the Big Creek bridge was funded in part by the federal government, so if the government can recover that money from the bonding company, will it be required to remit it back to Canada, or can it still be used by the Yukon government?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: What this question is really about is completing an unprecedented amount of infrastructure investment across the territory — as the Member for Pelly-Nisutlin will know — the Nisutlin Bay bridge; the Crooked Creek bridge just south of Stewart Crossing; road infrastructure by Yukon contractors on the north Klondike, pursuant to the national trade corridors funding; the unprecedented investment in the Erik Nielsen Whitehorse International Airport in excess of \$250 million to build a new parallel runway and to rebuild the main runway, which dates back in parts to 1942 and 1943, including new lighting and apron.

This is an incredibly exciting time in the Yukon for infrastructure construction. This is the third consecutive year that the fiscal spending on capital has been either just below or just over \$500 million, in stark contrast to the spending that occurred under the prior Yukon Party, which barely crested \$200 million.

Ms. McLeod: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister didn't even try to answer any of my questions. It makes me wonder why he doesn't want to talk about this bridge.

Since the original contractor abandoned the project, the government has issued at least two subsequent tenders for the bridge. One was to repair the bridge's concrete deck and the other was to complete the outstanding bridge work. The government has budgeted \$9 million for this work. When we take into account the original contract as well as the two subsequent contracts, how much has been spent on this project in total and how much does the minister anticipate will be recovered from the original contractor?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 2023, Julmac Contracting Ltd. filed a statement of claim with the Yukon Supreme Court. The Government of Yukon has counterclaimed for the as yet undetermined cost to complete the project and repair deficient work. Legal proceedings are continuing and we will be looking to recover the costs of fixing the deficient work through the litigation process. Because this matter is now before the courts, further comment would not be appropriate.

In any event, as I have reported, the Big Creek bridge is now completed and is operational, providing additional safe passage close to the Member for Watson Lake's home community. I just want to confirm that, once again in this year, we have an incredible capital expenditure in the Yukon, including the admittedly somewhat delayed completion of the Big Creek bridge.

But I can also report, Mr. Speaker, that the redundant fibre in the Klondike is almost complete as well — something that

was a little dream, a kernel of an idea, for the Yukon Party, but ultimately, we got it done.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

Notice of opposition private members' business

Mr. Kent: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the items standing in the name of the Official Opposition to be called on Wednesday, November 6, 2024. They are: Motion No. 1086, standing in the name of the Member for Kluane, and Motion No. 1098, standing in the name of the Member for Copperbelt North.

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.2(3), I would like to identify the item standing in the name of the Third Party to be called on Wednesday, November 6, 2024. It is Bill No. 308, standing in the name of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS

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

Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 40, standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Streicker.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that Bill No. 40, entitled *Act to amend the Clean Energy Act (2024)*, be now read a third time and do pass.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Speaker, let me just try to help set the stage for us today. We're here talking about the *Clean Energy Act*. This act is really about trying to create accountability for us as governments, including future governments. It's about working to make sure that we seek to address climate change and not say that we're going to seek to address it and then back away. We think that climate change is an incredibly important issue. We think that all Canadians and Yukoners want to take responsibility to transition away from fossil fuels and to move to this future where we are less reliant on fossil fuels — period — and at the same time where we have energy security and where we have energy reliability, energy affordability — all these sorts of questions. It is a very, very difficult thing to do because the integration of fossil fuels into our economy is pretty deep.

So, we have *Our Clean Future. Our Clean Future* as a strategy was developed by working with Yukoners; it was developed by working with Yukon First Nations; it was developed by working with Yukon municipalities, industry, and businesses. It's this vision that we have that we can get to a sustainable future.

The saying that I used to use is that "shift happens". So, it's just a little clever way to talk about it. It has been happening

and I'm so impressed with all the work that Yukoners have been doing, that our departments have been doing, that other governments have been doing — everyone. It's all of us needing to paddle in the same direction.

Part of that is that we set these targets for emissions reductions.

For the Yukon, it's 45 percent by 2030. The one we're talking about today is for the mining sector. For the mining sector, it is 45 percent by 2035 — intensity. For everyone — and it's all absolute at that point — it is zero by 2050. That's the goal.

What is the path to get to that goal? When we were in the last election, the Yukon Party said that they would have a carbon-pricing system. I'm reading from their platform. It's on page 9 of their platform, and there's a heading — on the section — that says: Adjusting to a made-in-Yukon carbon-pricing system.

So, at least when they were standing in front of Yukoners and putting their names forward to be elected, they said: Yes, we would address climate change.

Since then, that is not what has been happening. There was a motion this spring from the Member for Kluane about getting out of the carbon-pricing system, but what I don't hear is what they would put in place.

So, if the Yukon Party is not supportive of the *Clean Energy Act* — and I still am hopeful today that they will be, but if they're not, then what I'm always looking for is: What would you do instead? How will you work with Yukoners? Because they have asked us to make this transition away from fossil fuels. It is not going to happen by itself; we need to do this hard, hard work.

Today in the Assembly during Question Period, the Leader of the Yukon Party referred to us as "hypocritical"; I said it back. There are a couple of things that really get to me. Last week, we had the *Traffic Safety Act* and we talked about addressing issues of drinking and driving and how to improve our really not good stats here in the Yukon — this is a preventable crime — and the Yukon Party voted against it, but then on the Thursday — last Thursday — they stood up and gave a tribute to Mothers Against Drunk Driving. I could not figure out how they could do both of those things, but they did it.

When I think about this act that's before us and this amendment to it, what I hear and what I have heard with a lot of our initiatives, whether it was better buildings — or many issues — whenever we have sought to try to do more to reduce our emissions, then the Yukon Party has tended to vote against that. I'll see where they get to today. Hope springs eternal.

Yet you can't both say that you vote against all of that and not come up with: This is what we would do.

This has been my concern nationally, this has been my concern internationally, and this has been my concern here in the territory.

During the debate, I want to say thank you to the NDP. They did give me a heads-up about the amendment that they were looking to bring in. I think it was a principled thing that they were looking for, which was to change the target date for

the mining intensity targets from 2035 to 2030, to move it up effectively by five years, and so there was healthy debate about that. I spoke about how impressed I was with the mining industry and what they have brought forward.

Whenever I have been working on this issue, there has always been this need to make sure that the targets that you are putting in place have the ability to be achieved, because if we don't, we will lose the industry from working toward it. I talked about that partnership being important and that we wanted to keep the 2035 target, because my sense was that if we gave the earlier date, we would not only not achieve it, but we would achieve less.

There is one more thing that I wanted to try to point out. After we had our Committee of the Whole debate where we were going back and forth on questions and answers, I went and looked up *Our Clean Future*, because the director of the Energy branch had pointed something out to me, and I just wanted to share that with everyone. If you look in *Our Clean Future* and you go to page 12 of the document, it shows where all of our emissions are — well, it would be a few years old now, but it's roughly speaking about what the emissions are in the territory. And if you look at that graph, mining is at 10 percent, road transportation is at 54 percent, and heating is at 21 percent. These are much bigger chunks of the pie.

There is another piece of pie there; it is the fourth largest in this pie, and it is aviation — seven percent. Mining was 10 percent. Why did we go with an intensity target? It is because mining can see big increases and big decreases year over year and it is very hard for a jurisdiction the size of the Yukon to adjust to that and to set absolute targets. I have always said that the Yukon Party twice used those absolute emissions reductions based on drops in the mining industry to claim that they were reducing emissions. Neither time was that correct. I know that they knew it wasn't right, but that is what was said publicly.

Right now, in that graph, mining was at 10 percent; however, we have just seen the Victoria Gold mine close down. We saw Minto mine close down last year. It would be much less than 10 percent. Let's say that it's comparable to aviation. In *Our Clean Future*, if you dive into it and look at it sector by sector, what you will find is that we don't have good solutions for aviation right now. There is nothing that we know of on the horizon that will significantly reduce those emissions, so the things that we have are trying to support more fuel-efficient aircraft, which is what we have been doing with Air North, and that will help to bring down emissions.

We have been working, for example, with Tourism and Culture to be part of the United Nations International Network of Sustainable Tourism Observatories, I think it is. We are working with them around the sustainability of tourism and with air traffic. The way we do that is to try to encourage visits, rather than coming multiple times to the Yukon, to come and stay for an extended visit, so it's one flight and a longer stay. That's the way we try to address the aviation sector, but really, we don't have a significant reduction in the aviation sector.

Even though the whole-of-Yukon target is for 45 percent by 2030, in some sectors, like heating and road transportation,

our target is higher, and in some sectors, it's lower. It's not always one unified thing. That's where we get back to this overall plan that we have in front of us, which is to reduce emissions.

One more comment and then I will take my seat and listen to others speaking at third reading, again encouraging everyone to support the bill before us to amend the *Clean Energy Act*. Earlier today in Question Period, the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Yukon Party, asked about the borrowing of the Yukon Energy Corporation. I did send — I said it was a legislative return, which was a mistake; it was a casework. This was sent on October 31, so that's last week. It was based on questions that came up here in the Assembly on October 7 and then a letter written to me on October 8. Of course, I sent the letter, but the Development Corporation and the Energy Corporation helped to provide the information for the members opposite.

So, it was talking about borrowing through the Yukon Development Corporation, and that borrowing that was being discussed in Question Period today is — and I quote: "... fully recovered and paid back through energy sales..." as opposed to when we first came in here as government and found \$140 million, I think it was, in borrowing that had no plan to be paid back. When you borrow \$140 million and you have no plan to pay it back, that is long-term debt right away.

When the colleagues from the Yukon Party rise to speak to whether or not they support this bill and having accountability for future governments to address or transition away from fossil fuels to deal with climate change, to make sure that our mining sector becomes sustainable — because it is both critically important that we get it right for this energy transition and it's also critically important for the energy transition that we have the minerals that we will need for that transition, and that's not just here in the Yukon; that's Canada and North America — I just want to know what their plan is.

If it's not this, then what? I know that they're going to criticize this bill before us because it's not specific enough and it doesn't have all the details. But, of course, I have pointed out that the actions that we're going to take are those that we've already outlined in *Our Clean Future*. That's where we're starting with the mines, whether that's hard rock, placer, exploration, or reclamation.

So, I look forward to the debate today. I'm hopeful that, if the Yukon Party says that they're not going to support this, that they say to Yukoners what they would do instead. That's what I'm looking for.

Mr. Kent: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to the *Clean Energy Act* amendments here today at third reading.

I don't think that anyone will be surprised to hear that we in the Yukon Party believe greenhouse gas emissions need to come down, as they are influencing climate change and we are on the front lines of it here in the Yukon.

We see increased frequency and intensity, on average, of our wildfires. Changing climate patterns have increased flood risk in many areas of the Yukon. Communities in the north are

often cut off when ice roads are not able to be put in or their season is curtailed. Here in the Yukon, we've seen residents in West Dawson isolated for the winter waiting for an ice bridge that may or may not come.

When we talk about *Our Clean Future*, which was released by the previous Liberal government in 2020, we saw a plan that was ambitious and had a road map for us to get to its stated goal. I'm going to quote from that document: "By 2030, we will reduce Yukon's total greenhouse..." — gas — "... emissions from transportation, heating, electricity generation, other commercial and industrial activities, waste and other areas so that our emissions in these areas are 30 per cent lower than they were in 2010." The document also stated — and I'll quote again: "We will make informed decisions that respectfully bring together traditional, scientific and local knowledge and Indigenous ways of knowing, doing and being."

Then, Mr. Speaker, we fast-forward to election day in 2021. The Liberals found themselves tied with the Yukon Party in the number of seats, in a minority position, so they turned to the New Democrats and signed a deal called "the confidence and supply agreement" to keep them in power. In that agreement, signed on April 28, 2021, with no consultation, the Liberals made the uninformed decision to increase the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets from 30 percent to 45 percent below 2010 levels.

When we first debated the original act, our party voted against it because the new target seemed unattainable and that appears to be playing out in recent annual reports, as in 2022, our GHG emissions have actually increased by one percent over 2010 levels. Some of the planned actions of the government when it comes to dealing with reducing emissions are failing miserably.

The Yukon Energy Corporation's 10-year renewable plan can no longer be found on their website, as they work on a new one. The YEC has told us that the near-term plan for dependable electricity generation is to rent more diesels. This will last indefinitely while the government sees renewable projects, like Atlin hydro and Moon Lake, fade away as permitting lags or funding dries up at the federal level.

The microgeneration program has become a victim of its own success, as it is paused while the government figures out what it is doing to the stability of our grid. When it comes to zero-emission vehicles, we are currently 4,300 units short of the 2030 vehicle target, and that's with only five years to go. In order to meet the target, Yukoners have to purchase on average 69 zero-emission vehicles each and every month, not to mention the \$21.5 million in unbudgeted subsidies that the Yukon government will need at the current rate that they're paying out.

The minister mentioned some of the questions earlier today in Question Period. I will review the Blues, but one of the things that the minister and the Premier both said was that the new diesel generating capacity will replace generating capacity at the Whitehorse diesel plant — the blue building, I think the Premier referred to. When you take a look at another current project that is before YESAB entitled "YEC — Whitehorse Air Emissions Permit Renewal", the project scope for that says —

quote: "The project involves the continued operation and maintenance of the existing Whitehorse Thermal Generating Station, with no change in production capacity." I'm hoping that the minister can explain how the new production and the expanded production in Dawson, Faro, and Mayo can connect with what we see in the project scope of an air emissions permit renewal that is currently before YESAB that shows total production capacity from thermal at 42 megawatts.

While the original legislation arbitrarily changed the targets from 30 to 45 percent, it did so without penalty, which is the same for the mining industry in these amendments. I note that the minister didn't talk about that, but he did call it "accountability". So, then we come to the amendments before the House to introduce intensity targets for the mining industry at 45 percent below baseline by 2035. I know that the minister doesn't believe this, but we believe that details matter when we're setting targets in legislation. This is an aggressive goal and it has been brought here without full consideration of its impacts or how it's going to be done.

The Liberals don't know how they will calculate the targets; the minister mentioned that to me in Committee of the Whole. The Liberals don't have the baseline set yet; again, that was mentioned during Committee of the Whole. The Liberals' plan for the placer industry is to use renewable diesel, which the minister told us is 30 to 60 cents per litre more expensive than conventional diesel today. Of course, fuel is one of the most expensive items for placer miners and the minister thinks it's okay to add this amount to that line item for them, but the kicker, Mr. Speaker, is that he is not even sure if the fuel will even work in the Yukon, and he's asking us to support these amendments, but he doesn't have a plan.

It will be interesting to see where we're at in 2030 and in 2035. I am certainly hopeful that we make progress. We need to make progress, but these targets seem unattainable based on the trajectory that we're on and all the gaps that exist in the implementation. Given these concerns, we will be voting against these amendments. As we voted against the original act, we will be voting against the act that is before us today.

MLA Tredger: So, as we consider this piece of legislation today, these amendments to the *Clean Energy Act*, there are things in this piece of legislation that are very good, and there are things that are not. I'm going to start by talking about what I think is good in this act.

I applaud this act for having the intention that mining, like every other sector in the Yukon, should have expectations and targets around reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

This act provides mechanisms for the tracking and the accounting of emissions from the mining sector. That is not a trivial thing. I know that mountains of work went into creating this — everything from carefully crafting definitions of what exactly "mining" is and how we categorize it to the legalities of how we access the information that we need to track emissions.

This is really important work that lays the groundwork for a meaningful emissions-reduction target. I know it has been many years coming, and I know a lot of work has gone in to get

it to this point. That is something that we are really happy to see in this act — this mechanism.

What I am not happy to see in this act is the target that has been chosen for the reductions by the mining industry. So, the target that was chosen by the Liberals in this act is insufficient to support a livable planet. That's based on information from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. They clearly lay out that 45-percent reduction in emissions by 2030 is required for a livable planet; 45 percent by 2030 is the target that the rest of the territory is expected to meet. I'm very proud of the role that the Yukon New Democratic Party played in making that target happen.

But the Liberals have chosen to do something different for mining. They have chosen to give up on what is required for a livable planet and instead have chosen a target of a 45-percent reduction by 2035. They have chosen a target that falls short of what is required for a livable planet.

When asked why, they have told us that it's an ambitious target, it's an achievable target, it's a significant target and that, really, this is the best we can do. None of that matters to the planet.

It's like stepping off a cliff and saying: Hey, gravity, I have an ambitious and achievable and significant plan to build a bridge. It's just not done yet, but I have really good reasons for that.

It doesn't matter. If you step off a cliff without a bridge, it doesn't matter how good your reasons are; you're going to fall. It's the same with the climate.

It doesn't matter how significant or achievable or ambitious your plans are; if we do not reduce our emissions by 45 percent by 2030, we have given up the hope of a livable planet.

When I look at this legislation, on one hand, we have the means to create a framework for setting emissions targets for mining and creating the tools that the government needs to track and monitor those emissions. On the other hand, the target that the Liberals have included in this legislation falls short of what is needed for a livable planet. When faced with a piece of legislation that has both really important work in it but also a target that gives up on the hope of a livable planet, what do we do? Well, we can try to change it and that is exactly what the Yukon NDP did. During Committee of the Whole, we moved to amend the timeline in this legislation to 2030 instead of 2035. A 45-percent reduction by 2030 is what has been said by the UN is required for a livable planet.

That is what we owe future generations. That is what we owe the youth who are chanting: You will die of old change; we will die of climate change. When I say that we will die of climate change — the youth of the Yukon saying that — they understand that it is not just them we are talking about. We understand that when we say a "livable planet", we mean that it is for everyone. We know that everyone in the world counts and a livable planet for everyone counts. I know that the youth mean the same thing. With those youth and future generations in mind, here in the Yukon and across the world, the Yukon NDP moved to amend this legislation to have a target that does create the possibility of a livable planet for all for the future.

What happened next is that every other party in this House voted it down. The Liberals voted against what is required for a livable planet. The Yukon Party voted against what is required for a livable planet. They joined forces to defeat our motion and leave this legislation with a target that, according to the UN and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is inadequate to have a livable planet.

So, that is where we are today. We are voting on a piece of legislation that lays the foundation for the essential work of monitoring and tracking and setting targets for emissions for the mining industry. It also has a target that is chosen by the Liberals that falls short of what is required for a livable planet.

We will be supporting this legislation today so that the work that has been done to create that mechanism and framework for mining emissions is not lost. This does not mean that we will support the target of 2035 or that we support the target of 2035, because the Yukon NDP does not, has not, and will not give up on the possibility of a livable planet for future generations. We commit ourselves to the climate action recommendations of the UN, to a reduction of the greenhouse gas emissions by 45 percent by 2030 for all sectors of the economy. That is what we will not stop fighting for. We will not stop fighting for a livable future for the planet — the entire planet.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for me to rise perhaps to address some of the comments made by the Member for Copperbelt South, because Yukoners listening this afternoon I believe would be left with the mistaken impression that there haven't been a lot of practical, meaningful, and aspirational actions undertaken by this government over the course of the last three years. I believe that it's instructive and helpful to put some of those on the record in response to the Member for Copperbelt South's concerns or, I suppose, skepticism.

With respect to *Our Clean Future*, I'm just highlighting some of the actions that have been taken, recognizing all of the time that — as we have heard many times over the last three and a half years — heating and transportation account for approximately 75 percent of Yukon's greenhouse gas emissions.

With respect to the Yukon government, we have been implementing guidelines for the government fleet to prioritize zero-emission vehicles and other low-carbon transportation options. We have integrated fuel efficiency into purchasing decisions for fleet vehicles to reduce emissions and fuel costs. We have provided support where possible for local food producers in the Yukon government procurement process. We have incorporated greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency into the decision-making process for prioritizing building retrofits and new construction projects. We have aligned our energy management program with an internationally standardized ISO 50001. We have implemented a management system to reuse government assets. We have piloted a carpool model for the Government of Yukon for intercommunity travel. Lastly, in March of this year, we completed the climate change vulnerability study of the

territory's highway network that will help to inform the prioritization of improvements to existing infrastructure being impacted by climate change. More detailed information on these climate actions is available on yukon.ca.

While we are proud of these completed actions, the department is also working hard on making progress on 23 other actions. Rather than giving an update on each action one by one, I want to now focus on some of the major projects that we are undertaking that will help to reach our climate goals.

The first thing that I would like to talk about is that there are actions we are taking to reduce emissions from our own buildings. We have set a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from our buildings by 30 percent by 2030. This aligns with our broader target of cutting emissions by 45 percent overall, and the Department of Highways and Public Works is taking bold and innovative steps to achieve these targets. We are focused on making government buildings less carbon intensive and more resilient to climate change.

We are decarbonizing our buildings by completing energy retrofits, installing renewable energy systems, and implementing other operational improvements. Before doing the retrofits, we conduct building assessments to identify and prioritize the best retrofit opportunities across our portfolio. Under *Our Clean Future*, we are committed to doing these assessments, and we have made great progress. Overall, HPW has completed 81 certified energy assessments on our high-emission Government of Yukon buildings. This past spring, we awarded a tender for the remaining 36 Yukon sites that are high-emitting government buildings — work that is expected to be completed in December 2024.

During the assessments, we consider greenhouse gas-reduction potential, energy costs-savings, and operational improvements. After the energy assessments are completed, we shifted our focus to delivering building retrofits. Building energy retrofits improves operational efficiency, decreases greenhouse gas emissions, and extends the building life cycle. They also make the building more comfortable for people by improving the quality of life, reducing noise, and improving the overall design aesthetic. I am proud to say that 31 building energy retrofits have been completed since 2019. These projects are estimated to have reduced 189 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per year.

Two retrofit projects that I would like to highlight are the Yukon University roof and skylight replacement project and the Elijah Smith Elementary School envelope upgrade. These projects may sound straightforward, but they will do a lot to improve the energy efficiency and life of both buildings while also making the buildings more comfortable for people.

At Yukon University, we are replacing the roof and skylights on three separate wings of the building. This will improve thermal efficiency and in turn will reduce the building's greenhouse gas emissions by 136 tonnes per year. This project will also improve the lifespan of the building and lessen maintenance costs. I am happy to say that the T-wing at the university has reached substantial completion. The A-wing is nearing completion, and work on the C-wing is scheduled to begin in summer 2025.

Similarly, we have upgraded the exterior insulation at Elijah Smith Elementary School to make it more energy efficient and comfortable for students, a project that was completed this past spring.

Retrofits are essential for meeting emissions targets, but it's also one piece of the puzzle. Currently, approximately 75 percent of energy used to heat and power Government of Yukon buildings comes from fossil fuels. Given this, we need to begin to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and find renewable heating sources. This is an *Our Clean Future* commitment, page 17, which brings me to biomass.

Biomass is an alternative way to heat buildings through the burning of wood. Using wood will reduce our need for non-renewable heating fuels, like oil and propane. The government currently heats four buildings using biomass: the Elijah Smith Elementary School, Whitehorse Correctional Centre, the Dawson City water treatment plant, and the Dawson City waste-water treatment plant.

In the fall of 2023, we completed the installation of the biomass heating system at Elijah Smith Elementary School in Whitehorse. This biomass system offsets the school's propane use and lessens our reliance on fossil fuels. This year, we are finalizing the expansion of Whitehorse Correctional Centre's biomass heating system to include the Young Offenders Facility and the Takhini Haven building.

Biomass is just one renewable energy source, and we are exploring other options, especially for our off-grid buildings. I'm excited to say that the department is progressing on our *Our Clean Future* commitment to install renewable electricity systems in off-grid government buildings. The final commissioning is underway for the battery and solar energy projects at the Klondike and Ogilvie highway maintenance camps along the Dempster Highway.

We are also moving ahead with battery and solar energy projects at the Tuchtua and Blanchard maintenance camps. A contract for their installation has been awarded. These camps currently rely on old diesel generators for power. Installing a renewable energy system at these sites will allow the generators to run less often. The Klondike and Ogilvie camp installations will replace approximately 103,000 litres of diesel fuel each year, further reducing our reliance on diesel-generated electricity and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 270 tonnes. The Tuchtua and Blanchard camp installations, once complete, will replace approximately 98,000 litres of fuel and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 260 tonnes per year.

It is exciting to see these projects move forward, and we are actively looking into more ways to incorporate renewable energy.

Since 2021, we have conducted large feasibility studies to evaluate biomass, geothermal, and other renewable energy options at 66 sites across the territory. These studies, now complete, will identify several renewable energy projects that could be constructed over the next several years. For instance, in the Whitehorse area, we will investigate geothermal energy potential by testing existing and new bore-holes, and around Whitehorse and Haines Junction, we will test air-source heat pumps on existing government buildings.

Mr. Speaker, we are actively designing and building two renewable heating systems, with one each in Whitehorse and in Haines Junction. These two projects are supported by the Government of Canada's low-carbon economy challenge funding program. These systems will use renewable energy to significantly reduce our reliance on propane and oil and ultimately lessen our impact on the environment.

With respect to transportation, while significant parts of the Yukon's emissions come from our buildings, our largest source of emissions is actually from the transportation sector. About 39 percent of the Yukon's total emissions come from road transportation. This is why, within *Our Clean Future*, we are reducing emissions from government vehicles. Mr. Speaker, our original goal was to have 50 percent of our newly purchased passenger cars to be zero-emission, but we are going even further. When replacing vehicles, we are now incorporating greenhouse gas emissions reductions into the decision-making process, which is action T2, and in areas where fully electric vehicles are not feasible, we are prioritizing fuel efficiency in our vehicle purchases.

In support of this initiative, we now have 13 hybrid pickup trucks, 12 plug-in SUVs, three full-battery/electric vans, three full-battery/electric cars, two full-battery/electric trucks, and 30 full-battery/electric compact SUVs as part of our fleet pool, totalling approximately 10 percent of the fleet. Another great opportunity for emissions reduction is our heavy-duty fleet, where we aim to fully upgrade our fleet with more fuel-efficient equipment by 2030.

Making sure our vehicles are more efficient and not producing emissions is an important goal; however, we also want to strive for fewer vehicles on the road overall, which is why we are developing guidelines for the design of active transportation facilities throughout the Yukon. A project that is now underway, following a contract award in June, will guide the design of active transportation facilities along highways that are safe and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities. We want Yukoners to have an option to safely walk, bike, or even kick-sled to their destination whenever possible.

Thanks to our government's e-bike rebate program, more Whitehorse residents than ever are commuting on e-bikes and cargo e-bikes. I believe that number is now in the range of 1,100 to 1,200 rebates having now been issued, an absolute stunning success.

As a result, we are seeing an increased need for active transportation infrastructure along the Alaska Highway. Last summer, we completed a paved trail from Robert Service Way to Two Mile Hill as part of the Alaska Highway safety improvements. We are now developing plans to expand the multi-use trail along the Alaska Highway through Whitehorse and connect it with the city's extensive trail network.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly could go on, but all I would say is that there has been a significant investment by this government — whether it has been the Department of Highways and Public Works, the Department of Environment, or the Department of Community Services and other departments — in practical solutions to reducing our transportation and heating footprint. We continue to do this, and my colleagues and I try to identify

opportunities on a weekly basis. These are exciting times. Did we know that the targets for 2030 would be ambitious? Absolutely, but a shout-out to the officials at the various departments for putting their noses down, rolling up their sleeves, and working hard to identify plans that have the best possible impact on greenhouse gas reductions.

Although I heard the Member for Copperbelt South and the message — how I would paraphrase his message is that, because you have — because it's hard — because the work is hard, you should abandon the work. Now, that makes no sense. Our children and grandchildren expect us to do the hard work, and this government — and I'm sure that the members opposite hear it loud and clear from their constituents; we hear it from the youth at climate change rallies and other climate change rallies. We heard it most recently from Yukon seniors. So, they want us to do the hard work; we are prepared to do so, and this is another element of that hard work.

These are challenging but exciting times, and I commend the officials in all of the relevant departments for all of their hard work and dedication over the course of the last three and a half, now almost four, years in reaching these ambitious targets.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: I am not going to be long this afternoon, but I do have a few remarks that I would like to make on a subject that has been important to me for much of my professional life. We are here today again talking about an issue central to our government, which is the protection of our environment. When I was working at the paper, shortly after the beginning of the new millennium — mid-2000s — we changed the paper. Normally, the environment section of the paper is relegated to the back section of the paper — the very back sections, the least important parts of the paper at the very back end — and the business section is usually the B section right after the main news.

At the paper, we changed that. We actually fused the business and environment sections together, because they have to go hand in glove. You don't have a good environment without dealing with the business, whatever business it is. You can't have good business unless you deal with the environment, so we fused these things together to give the environment more relevance and to try to tie it together for people in their minds. "Business Environment", it was called. I believe that today it still goes hand in glove, and my good colleagues the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources have both spoken and will speak eloquently this afternoon again on this subject, probably far more eloquently than I.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been a central tenet of my life to bring attention to a crisis in the amount of pollution that humanity is tossing into the air. We have done it. We have always exceeded expectations as a species. We never thought we could cut down all the rainforest or the Amazon, but we've done that. We didn't think we could farm out the cod, but we did that.

We couldn't pollute the Great Lakes — it was way too big a body of water — we did that. We routinely exceed our own

expectations. You couldn't — there is no way that industry and the planet could pollute the atmosphere of our planet; that is incredible. There is no way we could do that, and yet here we are; we have done it.

We have to deal with these things, and we have, as a society, dealt together to deal with these things — be it acid rain: We came together and passed, globally, standards to prevent that. Now it is climate change. We call it “climate change”, but basically, it is man-made pollution throwing so much crap into the atmosphere that we are basically changing the environment around us, wiping out species, acidifying our oceans, changing ocean currents, and it is a central tenet — a central fear, I would say — in our society right now running through our fear, and everybody is thinking about it. We are seeing wildfires, and we are seeing floods.

The Member for Copperbelt South actually alluded to it today, and I am glad that he did. I am glad that he finally acknowledged some of the problems — the flooding, the fires, people being stranded because rivers that used to freeze routinely are now not freezing anymore, stranding people who bought houses on the far side of a river from getting home or getting to medical services, dental services, and to getting food. It is a problem. I will tell you, freezing rivers — humanity freezing rivers — is not an easy thing to do. I can speak from experience. I saw recent newspaper accounts of people thinking that they are going to re-freeze the Arctic Ocean. I think, man, good on you; good luck.

These are stop-gap solutions; what we really have to do is reduce our pollution. That is really what is at the heart of what we are talking about this afternoon: the *Clean Energy Act*. I am very, very heartened that we brought this forward, and I hope that it succeeds. I certainly support it.

But for all of us, we have to think — my colleague the Minister of Environment has spoken about *Our Clean Future*, the nation-leading climate change action plan that our government brought into force. When that came in, the civil service — we met with them — and we spoke about it at the time when the first draft came out, and it had to be measurable. We had to have costs associated with it. It had to be built into our society, and we had to report on a regular basis. Those things are in this report.

I started by talking about the mid-2000s. I remember other governments — they had no plan. It was frustrating. I'll tell you, it was frustrating for me. It was frustrating for students at the time who are now adults and who are watching what we're doing. It has been a highlight of my professional career to be able to work with a team such as this. I can identify every one of my Cabinet and caucus colleagues about their commitment to this cause and how passionate they are about it.

The Minister of Environment has chronicled some of the things we've done. There's a long list. It's not everything, but it's certainly a huge stab at all the work we're doing. We're talking about restructuring the way we do landfills, which helps reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Tough work — it's a big change for people, but it's important. Getting retrofits to buildings through the Better Buildings program — that was

huge to do. I wish it had happened earlier, because I too want a liveable planet.

I want to act, and I want to make sure these things happen as fast as possible so we can take advantage of these things and start to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, start to reduce the amount of pollution we're chucking into the atmosphere so that perhaps we can bend the curve a little bit so that future generations have an easier time of it and will grow up on a planet much the same as I had the pleasure of growing up on as a young boy.

For much of my professional life, that's really something I've striven for. It's something that the Minister for Energy, Mines and Resources has striven for, I know, for much of his professional life. Working with somebody as knowledgeable, as diligent, as conscientious as he is — both he and the Minister of Environment put me to shame. They live this stuff; they're phenomenal ambassadors for clean living. It has been an honour to work and hear their thoughts on this issue that has been so important to me and to work with this team on behalf of Yukoners.

One of the things that really is particularly upsetting to me is Canadians' as a whole outright rejection of carbon pricing right now, throwing out a program that is endorsed by much of the world and much of the world's educational institutions and economists as being the best signal to start to effect change. We're seeing in BC and we've seen in other jurisdictions that have embraced this that their economies do better; the pollution goes down; the change starts to happen.

Because it's sort of the — so now, the populists are taking over, and they are great slogans — certainly catchy slogans — but the downstream effects of the actions that governments across the country are taking in rejecting carbon pricing will have real-world effects on this nation, and I haven't heard anything yet to replace it — nothing — nothing.

I hear an action, but that action is going to subvert all of the progress that we have made on this central issue to our nation and to our species, really, and those of other species on the planet — and they're tossing it out with nothing to show, nothing to replace it. To be one of the last governments in the country standing for change, standing for improvements to the way that we deal with energy and pollution, to me, this afternoon — as ballots are being cast in the United States — it will soon have either a positive or a very negative effect on this very issue. It's meaningful and something that I'm reflecting on a lot. It's sad to me that we're at this place with nations — with governments, rather — rejecting a proven tool in changing people's energy decisions to shill for a few votes. That's all it is. It doesn't make any sense, except at the ballot box. I'm proud of our team's resolute defense of this principle.

Now, we have talked a little about the planet this afternoon, and I hear the Member for Whitehorse Centre, but what we see in the *Clean Energy Act* is this government's attempt to hold fast to an achievable, though hard to achieve, goal. While I understand the need to try to do more, I think that sometimes in that pursuit, you can actually subvert the very cause that you're trying to embrace.

We have to consider business and get business on board with what we're doing as we try to fix our environment. You cannot do one without the other. You have to do it together in tandem so that we have a concerted effort that's achievable together. We don't want to lose the business community in our effort. We don't want to lose their support, and I think that my colleague has spoken about that and how important it is to keep them on board.

It is a delicate balance, this political game, and I have the utmost respect and confidence in my colleague to strike that balance.

Ms. White: I thank my colleagues for their statements today. I think I might go back in time a little bit, because on October 28, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the mover of this bill had a lot of really interesting things to say about the NDP. I thought that maybe I would take this opportunity to lay out where we stand in the hope that maybe he will apologize for some of those comments.

On October 28, he said that the NDP — we wanted to shut down mining. He said that based on a press release that we put out in support of the Na-Cho Nyäk Dun, which asked for a pause on new mining in their territory. It was so interesting during Question Period to hear the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources accusing the Yukon Party of misconstruing his words and his intentions, but it's interesting, because I had that happen to me on October 28. He stood up in here and said that the NDP was against mining and that we were flat out against it. That's not the truth; it's not the truth. We can't have a renewable future without mining critical minerals.

To be fair, the Liberals don't make a difference between critical minerals and luxury minerals. We have asked for those differences to be highlighted, but that hasn't happened.

So, the minister stood here very confidently and said that the NDP was against mining — not true.

I think my favourite line from October 28 — and I'm going to quote from it, on page 5866 — and this is what he says, "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."

Something interesting I would say about me — having been in this Chamber for 13 years — is that I'm pretty consistent. When my ego gets in the way of decisions that I think are important, I, like, chuck that ego. So, to have the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources accuse the NDP — accuse me — of standing on moral high ground when it comes to climate change, when it comes to combating climate change, I take offence. I take offence. We tried to move the bar. We had all sorts of reasons why it didn't happen. I mean, it's so interesting, because in the last comments that we heard from the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Community Services, we have heard things like: ... prepared to do the hard work — that's a quote — challenging but exciting times.

We heard the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources say that part of the reason why we need backup diesel generators is because there wasn't as much rainfall in the Aishihik system as

we would anticipate — interestingly enough, an effect of climate change. So, when we proposed a faster target, it was with all of that in mind. It was with all of that in mind.

But it's important to note that never once will ego get in the way of doing what is right. We disagree with the number; we think that it should be lower; we think that it should be 2030. We think that we need to do more; we think that we should do it faster. But when the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources accused us of standing on moral high ground, saying that he wasn't sure where we were going to go with this, but he was waiting for the press release to see what it would say —

So, here we go. You heard from my colleague the Member for Whitehorse Centre — we're going to vote in favour of it. The interesting thing is that this is the only hope that the Liberals have right now of getting this passed. So, if it were about my ego and my frustration, we could talk about the *Elections Act* changes. We could talk about my frustration with that. Will I let that interfere with this? I won't.

We heard last week during the *Traffic Safety Act* — because we talked a bit about that today. Last week, we heard about how important it was to make important changes to legislation on the floor to make it better. We didn't see that with electoral boundaries, though, did we? What we saw the NDP do is that we tried to do exactly what we have done all of the time — saying that we need to do better and we need to do it faster. But at no point in time will our ego get in the way of doing what we believe is right, even though we think that we should go further and we should go faster.

So, I invite the minister in his comments to apologize about his comments about the NDP: "... seek to make it so that they can stand on moral high ground while working to undermine that ability to achieve the reductions."

Those are pretty strong words. They pack a lot of meaning there. So, I stand here as the closing speaker for the Yukon NDP to say that we will be supporting this bill not because we think it goes far enough but because we realize that it's important.

Like my colleague the Member for Whitehorse Centre said, it lays the groundwork, but we'll keep pushing on that groundwork. We'll keep pushing to go further and to go faster.

I do thank all the officials who did the work to get this here. I recognize that there is a lot of work to be done.

With that, I look forward to the vote and moving on.

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

Does any other member wish to be heard?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I want to begin by thanking everyone who spoke at second reading.

I will try to respond to some of the things that I heard. It's never possible to get at it all.

First of all, to the Member for Copperbelt South — based on remarks from the Member for Copperbelt South — I said when I stood: If you're not going to support this, what would you do? Where would you go?

Frankly, I've not seen support from the Yukon Party on many things to do with climate change. So, I went back and

looked up — because the member said that they did support *Our Clean Future*. So, I went back while I was sitting here listening to debate and dug out Hansard from 2020 — because in the fall of 2020, twice we brought forward a motion to see whether there was support for the targets under *Our Clean Future* from the members opposite, and it got filibustered. It didn't make it to a final debate, so there is no final vote, but when I read the submissions from the NDP, they were supportive of targets and, in fact, were even pressing for stronger targets.

But it was a day and a half of debate, so I haven't been able to read it all. When I looked back — so, it was from November 18 and December 2, 2020. I looked back to try to see what the Yukon Party was saying about it, but generally speaking, what I can read there is that they were not supportive. That's in the original version of *Our Clean Future*.

Then the Member for Copperbelt South stood and said: Under the confidence and supply agreement, you agreed to enhance those targets without public engagement.

Of course, we had a lot of public engagement, so we did know what the public had been saying about things — and then said: We didn't support it then because you agreed to those stronger targets.

But they did support it because — I think that it was on November 24, 2021 in this House when the Leader of the Yukon Party said that he would honour the confidence and supply agreement. He spoke about it in support. That makes it difficult to go both ways. You can't both criticize the confidence and supply agreement but say that you would sign up for it.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Streicker: So, the members opposite are saying: Yes, you can do that. Of course —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Okay, that is fair enough. If the members opposite say that they would honour it without agreeing or believing in it, then that sounds like hypocrisy to me.

Let me turn now to the comments from the Leader of the NDP and the House Leader of the NDP. I do agree that you want to reduce emissions as much as possible. That is what we want to try to achieve and we just happen to disagree with what will get us to those emissions reductions more. My perspective or the perspective that we are bringing forward is that it is important to have industry working with you.

How do you know who is right on these things? It is not easy and I look back — and this is where I shape my perspective. Years ago, let's say roughly 20 years ago — maybe it was 2005, or it might have even been early 2006 — I was asked to be a witness to one of the Government of Canada's standing committees on environment and economy, I think it was. They asked two other economists and me to come to talk about the Kyoto Protocol.

At that point, it wasn't in effect yet, but I came as a climate scientist and I happened to meet two economists. They sat on either side of me. One of them I still remain colleagues with, because he has been so succinct in talking about what we really

need to do to address climate change. His name is Dr. Mark Jaccard. He is currently the chair of the British Columbia Utilities Commission, and he said then and he has since said here when he has been brought to the Yukon to talk about how to come up with a strategy to address climate change that the first thing that you need to do is you need to set targets. Then, you need to make commitments to those targets, and then you have to have a plan that shows the steps you are going to take to achieve those targets. Then, in that plan to achieve those targets, you need to have a strategy to put a price on pollution.

The most common way to get there is a carbon price, but there are other ways. There is a cap-and-trade system. It would be hard to imagine that here in the Yukon, but there are different possibilities about how to get there. So, whenever I check in with economists who deal with how to address climate change, I always watch to see how they talk about how we help to incent citizens to make the choices over time to move in the right direction. A price on pollution has always been one of them, as are targets.

The *Clean Energy Act* is about setting the targets and about making commitments to future governments that future governments have to continue to be transparent about whether or not we are achieving them, what we're doing to achieve them, and if they want to back away from them, they have to come to this Assembly to do that.

The Member for Copperbelt South talked about how one of the reasons why they are not going to support this is because we are still seeing an increase in emissions here in the Yukon. He mentioned that there was a one-percent increase, but, of course, we have seen huge amounts of growth. Our GDP has grown by much more than one percent. Our population has been growing incredibly, so when you start to see that your emissions are decoupling from your gross domestic product, that is the first sign that we continue to talk about as to how we are allowing for the growth of our economy, making sure that it is working with respect to our economy — not hurting it — while also starting to reduce emissions.

Again, I just know — the climate scientist in me says, "Show me what you would do instead", and I don't hear it.

Okay, let me turn now to the NDP. I did look up the very quotes that the member was talking about. I see it on a different page than was just listed. I'm looking at page 5840, but maybe I have the wrong page. I will talk about the hard choices that you are faced with. I appreciated the Leader of the NDP talking about how critical minerals will be needed for achieving this transition away from fossil fuels. I really did appreciate those words.

And I said — sorry, I'm just pulling up so I can get it here; anyway, I will have to find my own quote — but I appreciate the member raising it, and I agree that what the NDP has been saying was to — you could call it "pause", but it had no end date. Really, I'll start with the First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun. They asked us to stop mining within their traditional territory. The member opposite used the word "pause", but there is no end date to that pause specifically. Those things aren't there.

Of course, exploration doesn't have heap leach or cyanide. It's not even in production. So, that's what was being asked, is that we stop the one other active mine that isn't mining gold and doesn't have heap leach. We were also being asked to stop exploration projects, ones that had gone through YESAB, gone through the Water Board, and we said no to the First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun — that we disagreed with closing down those other things in their traditional territory.

I should have said that the NDP supported the First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun in pausing mining in their traditional territory, but that is exactly — and those are the hard, hard choices that we're talking about here.

If you're going to say on one hand that it is all about achieving emissions reductions, but you get these choices — and I appreciated that the Leader of the NDP said and talked about First Nation sovereignty and the ability to make decisions on traditional territory — that was what the member opposite said — and I appreciate that it is the hard choice that they landed with around this, and it just points out that there are hard choices in front of us. So, one of the choices that we proposed is that it's better to work with the industry.

Let me just close off talking about Dr. Mark Jaccard. That day when I was there presenting to politicians in Ottawa on that standing committee on the environment and the economy, one of the questions that they asked Dr. Jaccard was whether or not we could reach our Kyoto commitment, and he said that, no, we couldn't. The reason was that we hadn't put in place the actions to provide the time for our economy to make that adjustment. I remember feeling pretty gutted in that moment, because when I recognized that we weren't going to get there — and I talked to him about that, and he said: It's more important that what you do is get the actions in place and that you work with the economy, industry, Canadians to make sure that you're working to reduce those emissions.

So, that is what we have in front of us. I still believe that the choice of 2035 is going to achieve more than if we set a target that can't be achieved or that does not have the support of industry and that we lose their actions. So, it is my submission to us as a House that this will get us there faster, but I can hear that the NDP has the belief that it's more important to have that stronger target in place. That is a trade off. I totally get that difference.

The part that I don't agree with has to do with the Yukon Party, because each time we have had a vote, whether it's on *Our Clean Future* back in 2020 or whether it is everything we have done in between, I have not seen their support for any of the actions that we've been talking about. Maybe I'm wrong there too, and maybe the Member for Copperbelt South can point out to me which ones they have supported, but I have just not found any. I am just basically asking the Yukon Party back: What is your plan? You can't just sort of say that climate change is important and then work on pixie dust; you actually have to have realistic strategies in place to achieve that transition.

Anyway, again, I thank everyone for the healthy debate that we've had today, and I look forward to the vote on this bill.

Speaker: Are you prepared for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Division.

Division

Speaker: Division has been called.

Bells

Speaker: Mr. Clerk, please poll the House.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Agree.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Agree.

Hon. Ms. McLean: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Agree.

Mr. Dixon: Disagree.

Mr. Kent: Disagree.

Ms. Clarke: Disagree.

Mr. Cathers: Disagree.

Ms. McLeod: Disagree.

Ms. Van Bibber: Disagree.

Mr. Hassard: Disagree.

Mr. Istchenko: Disagree.

Ms. White: Agree.

Ms. Blake: Agree.

MLA Tredger: Agree.

Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 10 yea, eight nay.

Speaker: The yeas have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Motion for third reading of Bill No. 40 agreed to

Speaker: I declare that Bill No. 40 has passed this House.

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The matter now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 52, Department of Environment, 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: Now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 52, Department of Environment, in Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*.

Department of Environment — continued

Chair: Is there any further general debate?

MLA Tredger: Thank you to everyone for being back here again today. I don't have too many more questions, but I will ask a couple.

I just want to start by asking about the report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans that came out in October 2024 entitled *Challenges to the Sustainability of the Yukon Salmon Stocks*.

That report had a number of recommendations specifically for the Yukon government. I was wondering if the minister is planning on responding formally to that report.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: A few preliminary comments. Firstly, it's great to be back in Committee of the Whole for the Department of Environment again. Once again, I'm welcoming, to my left, Assistant Deputy Minister Marc Cattet and, to my right, the Deputy Minister of Environment, Dennis Berry.

I certainly will answer the member opposite's question, but I just wanted to get a response on the record from yesterday.

I would like to return to a question posed by the member from the Third Party during debate yesterday afternoon. The Member for Whitehorse Centre asked: What percentage of funding from Canada has been flowed through to Yukon First Nations, and what percentage of funding has stayed in the Department of Environment in the Government of Yukon?

As the member opposite will know, approximately \$20.7 million has been allocated for the *Canada-Yukon Nature Agreement* implementation over three years. I can confirm that so far \$2.6 million, or approximately 13 percent, has been committed to Yukon First Nations, transboundary governments, and groups. We are also supporting the Council of Yukon First Nations with funding through the nature agreement to support dialogue around wildlife and conservation. We continue to work with Indigenous partners to disburse the nature agreement funds to support their conservation priorities.

The nature agreement funding provides the Government of Yukon the opportunity to accelerate conservation-led initiatives. This work includes being better prepared for regional land use planning processes. We are aware that the Government of Canada has separate bilateral agreements with Yukon First Nations to support conservation-related work. Addressing climate change and biodiversity loss requires a collective approach across all governments. We will continue to work with all partners to achieve our mutual goal of protecting land and water for future generations.

That was an update from yesterday, and with respect to salmon, the Government of Yukon is aware of the report from

the federal Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans regarding the challenges to the sustainability of Yukon River salmon stocks. The report highlights a significant decline in wild Pacific salmon populations in the Yukon, particularly chinook and chum salmon, with concerning statistics and trends over recent years. It emphasizes that the decline in salmon populations severely impacts Yukon First Nations, affecting food security, cultural practices, and community health. For example, traditional fish camps and ceremonies are disrupted, leading to a loss of cultural heritage and increased social issues. Multiple factors contribute to the decline, including climate change, competition with hatchery salmon, predation by seals, Alaskan commercial fisheries, habitat loss, changing river conditions, and mining projects.

The report echoes the priorities that we have identified in discussions with salmon recovery partners through the Yukon River Panel and joint salmon rebuilding committee. We welcome the recommendations from the federal government to strengthen its collaboration with other levels of government and across jurisdictions, particularly Alaska and the United States, and increase its support of locally led salmon recovery efforts informed by traditional and local knowledge.

With recognition of the tremendous impact that the Yukon River salmon decline has had on the Yukon First Nation subsistence harvest, culture, food security, and traditional practices, we will continue to thoroughly assess the recommendations and identify any potential actions in due course.

I would like to thank the committee and the organizations and individuals who participated as witnesses, drafted and submitted briefs, or otherwise contributed to this report's drafting and publication. The Yukon government remains committed to working with Yukon First Nations and the Government of Canada to rebuild salmon stocks in the territory. I can just advise that I was one of the witnesses at this committee a number of months ago.

I think that answers the question. I would just say in the remaining time that I have that — Yukoners will likely know — just over 24,000 Yukon River chinook entered Canada, meeting the pre-season forecast of between 19,000 and 28,000. However, this remains significantly below the goal of 71,000 Canadian-origin chinook reaching the international border. But of note, only 14,074 entered Canada in 2023. These might be the guarded first steps in improving salmon stock. Those numbers are significantly higher from the one year to the next, as evidenced by the agreement with Alaska and the Yukon River Panel to agree to a seven-year moratorium on subsistence fishing in Alaska. Of course, the moratorium also exists and has existed de facto in Yukon for a long period of time.

I will leave it at that. I do have more information, but I think that largely answers the question.

MLA Tredger: Can the minister provide a timeline? He said that the department was going to consider the recommendations and respond in due course. Does he have a sense of when that will happen?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I think the answer would be that we will be responding. We will respond as soon as is practicable.

It also involves liaising with other departments, most notably, Energy, Mines and Resources, but just to confirm, we will continue to thoroughly assess the recommendations and have a considered response. So, the answer would be: as soon as is practicable, given our obligation to engage in due diligence and come up with a considered response.

MLA Tredger: I won't ask too many more detailed questions about those recommendations then, since it is a fairly recent report, but the minister can expect me to ask questions about the recommendations targeted at the Yukon government in the Spring Sitting. I look forward to hearing the response from the department when that comes about.

I wanted to ask a few questions about the bison conservation and action plan. I know that it has already been discussed with the Member for Kluane, but I have a couple of questions that haven't been covered yet, so I'm going to ask those now. That's my last topic for today.

I first wanted to ask: Is there an estimate of the cost of implementing the plan? The plan includes a large amount of data to collect and a lot of monitoring, so I'm wondering what the cost is estimated to be and how much funding has been budgeted for the implementation of the plan.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The officials are just endeavouring to get the answer to that question. If we can't get that answer, we will certainly get back to the member opposite as soon as possible.

Was the question with respect to what the total cost has been for the Department of Environment with respect to work with the Aishihik bison technical team? Is that the specific question? Thank you for your anticipated clarification.

MLA Tredger: I would be interested in whatever information the department brings back. I was thinking of the costs of the plan in general — how much it's expected to cost overall to implement the plan — as well as how much has been budgeted to implement the plan overall. I know that there are pieces of it with the Department of Environment and probably with other departments as well.

I would be interested in either of the Department of Environment's costs or the whole-of-government costs.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for that clarification. We will make best efforts to return with as much information as possible with respect to the current budgeting requirements, but one observation I do have is that many of the actions are enabling and the costs would be dependent on the recommendations that are ultimately implemented. As I indicated, I will endeavour to get back and answer the specific question that the member opposite had with respect to the Aishihik bison technical team and the Aishihik bison management plan.

MLA Tredger: Thank you to the minister for that. I look forward to that.

The plan commits the bison technical team to develop an implementation plan to prioritize actions. I am wondering if the minister has a timeline on when that implementation plan will be ready.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will provide some high-level background on the Aishihik bison technical team, but the high-

level response from my officials is that it is a co-management plan. It will be recommended to the minister, and there is no implementation plan yet that has been recommended to the minister.

Briefly, the Aishihik bison technical team, which includes all governments and organizations with a role in bison management, has collaboratively drafted a new management plan and process for the Aishihik wood bison herd in the southwestern Yukon. The Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board completed a 60-day public engagement on the draft plan and made recommendations.

The Government of Yukon completed consultation with Yukon First Nations on the draft plan and released the new conservation action plan for the Aishihik bison — as I said before, the bison population — on October 22. The new collaborative plan articulates a longer term vision and recommendations for conservation and management of the Aishihik bison population. I'll just confirm as far as the timeline — we do not currently have a timeline, but the Yukon government will work with the bison technical team to develop that implementation plan.

MLA Tredger: This will be my last question for today. The plan commits the Yukon government to develop protocols to prevent contact between wild bison and livestock and commits them to develop a contingency plan for how to deal with cases of bison coming into contact with farmed animals by 2023. Can the minister tell us if those protocols and plan are complete?

Since this is my last question, I will thank the officials for being here and thank the minister for answering questions and look forward to being up again in the spring.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The action plan will recognize the complexity of managing bison in the Yukon and the desire to manage the population adaptively.

Protocols with respect to livestock conflict have not yet been developed, but we will be working on them in consultation with the technical team. The Department of Environment is no stranger to — and the experts at the Fish and Wildlife branch at the Department of Environment are no strangers to dealing with livestock-conflict files with wild animals. I certainly have confidence that the team at Environment has the necessary expertise to assist in reaching a positive solution.

The strategies to managing for disease prevention, among other things, are preventing contact between free-ranging and captive bison, limiting imports of bison, controlling, eliminating, and/or preventing contact with plains bison, game farm bison, and cattle to mitigate hybridization or disease spread.

So, that's I would imagine but only one element of potential livestock-wild bison interaction, but that's an example of what Fish and Wildlife branch, the officials at Environment, would be working on with the Aishihik bison technical team.

Mr. Dixon: I appreciate the opportunity to ask a few additional questions of the minister today in Committee of the Whole. I would like to follow up on a number of issues that have been raised already, but the minister's answers have prompted some additional questions.

I'll begin on EPR. The minister provided some answers to my colleague from Whitehorse Centre yesterday about the EPR process and the process by which a producer responsibility organization becomes a recognized PRO. It's my understanding that happens upon submission of a stewardship plan to the Yukon government and its subsequent approval by the minister pursuant to the EPR regulations.

Can the minister begin by just confirming how many stewardship plans have been submitted to him that are currently being considered for approval?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Three stewardship plans have been submitted so far.

Mr. Dixon: Can the minister tell us which three organizations have submitted those plans?

I know that some of them have posted those stewardship plans online, and we're aware of them. For instance, Interchange Recycling has posted their draft stewardship plan on their website. Can the minister tell us which are the other two?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for the question. The three stewardship plans have been submitted by call2recycle for batteries, Interchange Recycling for waste oil and antifreeze — and I know that I answered a few questions on that organization during the course of the Fall Sitting — and Circular Materials for packaging and paper products.

Mr. Dixon: Are PROs meant to be exclusive? What I mean by that is: Can we imagine a situation where there would be multiple PROs within the same waste stream, or are they exclusive and we would only ever see one PRO in a singular waste stream?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will just endeavour to get that specific answer to the question while I'm on my feet, which I do anticipate being able to get, but I will just provide some brief background for Yukoners listening this afternoon.

The extended producer responsibility, or EPR for short, is a system that makes producers of packaging and products responsible for those materials at the end of the product's life. EPR shifts the cost of waste diversion from taxpayers who use the products to producers who actually create the products and reduces financial pressure on the municipalities and regional governments responsible for providing recycling services at the end of the product's life.

We are working with local industry, the City of Whitehorse, Yukon communities, and other government departments to develop this efficient and cost-effective waste diversion system. The priority materials for EPR implementation are paper products and packaging, which includes materials that you would normally put in the blue box, and hazardous and special products, such as paints, solvents, and waste oil.

The implementation of EPR is underway, and we expect programs to start operating over the next year after the program plans are developed and approved. As committed to in *Our Clean Future*, the Yukon is on track to implement EPR in the territory by 2025. With respect to the specific question, the regulation does not limit the number of PROs; however, due to the size of the Yukon, we would expect only one per waste

stream. Producers decide which PRO should represent them in a specific jurisdiction.

Mr. Dixon: Is membership in a PRO mandatory for a "producer" or a "steward", as defined by the EPR regulations?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will endeavour to answer the question, but I require some clarification — it just tailed off at the end there. So, the question was whether membership of the PRO is mandatory or — what was the alternative that was put forward by the member opposite? Thank you for my indulgence on that.

Mr. Dixon: Thank you, Madam Chair. There was no additional question there. I simply noted that "steward" and "producer" are defined in the regulation.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I am advised that membership with the PRO is not mandatory. The producer has a choice on whether to fulfill their obligations under the regulations themselves or through membership with a PRO. That is the answer, and I would imagine that it likely makes sense to be part of a PRO as far as efficiency, but the answer is that membership is not mandatory.

Mr. Dixon: If I understand then, membership for a producer in a PRO is not mandatory, but it is so administratively burdensome that it would be more advantageous for them to join a PRO. If I am incorrect in that, I invite the minister to correct me.

My other question on that front, Madam Chair, was in relation to when a PRO becomes recognized. Is it the fact that a PRO becomes recognized as such once they have had their stewardship plan approved by the minister?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Specifically with respect to the Leader of the Official Opposition, the member opposite's question about administrative burden, yes, that is correct, but also, for persons who might be listening this afternoon, the enforcement would look much the same whether a producer chooses to go alone or with a PRO. A PRO does become recognized when the stewardship plan is approved and a permit is issued to the PRO for the specific program.

Mr. Dixon: The minister noted that this is important information for those listening and perhaps for businesses who are listening. I would agree, and indeed, I have been asked these questions by a number of local businesses who have questions and concerns about the way this is rolling out.

In the case of Interchange Recycling, we are aware that Interchange Recycling has begun collecting environmental fees, ostensibly under the EPR framework of the Yukon. However, we are aware that Interchange Recycling has not yet had an approved stewardship plan. So, how can a PRO begin collecting fees from businesses when they haven't had their stewardship plan yet approved when, in fact, the stewardship plan includes the environmental fees that would be approved by the minister?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I did answer this question probably a few weeks ago, but I certainly welcome the opportunity to clarify this question for Yukoners who might be listening and are concerned about this. The producer responsibility organization Interchange Recycling began charging environmental handling charges to its Yukon members on July

1, 2024 for hazardous products, including lubricating oil, antifreeze, oil filters, diesel exhaust fluid, and automotive containers.

The fee charged by Interchange Recycling is not set or regulated by the Government of Yukon; it is a result of the business working with business in the private sector and the agreement between Interchange Recycling and their members. As a condition of the membership with Interchange Recycling, businesses are required to remit an EHC fee, which is an environmental handling charge. This is true for their membership in British Columbia as well as in the Yukon. Interchange Recycling has decided to charge its Yukon members EHC fees to assist with the development of the stewardship plan, not just implementation. The Government of Yukon is not collecting the fees, and Interchange Recycling was not expected to consult with the government on the EHC fees. Communication about the fee would have come directly from Interchange Recycling to their membership, not from the Government of Yukon.

EPR will be implemented in the Yukon for hazardous products once Interchange Recycling's stewardship plan is approved, which is anticipated, as I have indicated, for 2025. Let me just see if I have some more information from officials.

Yes, my advice from officials is consistent with what I have just advised the House and with what I advised the House a few weeks ago: The Department of Environment will not be approving the environmental handling fees; that cost is between a PRO and its members.

Mr. Dixon: Well, I'm aware of the minister's legislative return, and I have read it, and I appreciate him reading it again today, but fundamentally, the question I'm asking is: Why would a local business begin paying an environmental handling fee to a PRO or a so-called "PRO" — an organization that is not yet designated a PRO under the regulation — when they don't even have a stewardship plan approved yet? What would happen to the money that they paid to that organization if the minister did not approve their stewardship plan and they were not permitted to become a PRO?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will provide this answer again, and I can certainly try to find more for the member opposite, but the bottom line is that it's a result of business working with business in the private sector, and the agreement is between Interchange Recycling and their members.

As a condition of membership with Interchange Recycling, businesses are required to remit an EHC fee. This is also true of their membership in British Columbia as well as the Yukon.

Interchange Recycling has decided to charge its Yukon members this EHC fee to assist with the development of the stewardship plan, not just implementation.

Once again, the Government of Yukon is not collecting the fees, and Interchange Recycling was not expected to consult with the government on the EHC fees. Communication about the fees has come directly from Interchange Recycling to their membership, not from the Government of Yukon.

So, this is independent of confirmation of a stewardship plan and it is a private business-to-business communication, as

far as I'm advised. I will just see whether I have anything further.

I think that's consistent with the information that I have.

Mr. Dixon: So, if Interchange Recycling is not a recognized PRO, they do not have an approved stewardship plan, and yet they are charging local businesses a fee per product, and there is no regulatory or legislative requirement to pay that and there is no regulatory requirement to be a member of that organization. If I understand that correctly, what the minister is telling us is that businesses should not be paying environmental handling fees to this PRO at this time.

Can he confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will repeat myself because I believe this is a full answer to this question. Businesses will make their own decisions on this matter.

My information is that it's a result of businesses working with businesses in the private sector, and it's an agreement between the company Interchange Recycling and their members. As a condition of membership with Interchange Recycling, businesses are required to remit an EHC fee, as I indicated previously. This is true for the membership in British Columbia as well as the Yukon.

Interchange Recycling, once again, in the private sector, prior to the confirmation of the stewardship plan, has decided to charge its Yukon members the EHC fee to assist with the development of the stewardship plan, not just implementation.

I'm not going to provide advice as to what the current relationship — contractual or business decision relationship — decision ought to be between private businesses at this juncture, but it does seem like that is what has occurred.

While the PRO is not yet fully officially recognized until the plan is approved, producers have obligations to develop a plan and submit it to the government. The PRO is fulfilling certain obligations on the producers. I am not going to provide advice as to what should be occurring between two private companies.

Mr. Dixon: I would point out to the minister that what I'm talking about is not two private companies; it's a private company and an established PRO under the definition of the EPR regulation that his government passed. So, it's not two private businesses; it's a private business and an organization established under the EPR regulation.

That being said, it's pretty clear to me that if a business is not currently a member of Interchange Recycling, there is no regulatory requirement for them to pay these fees and they ought not to be doing that. From everything that I've heard from the minister, if a business is being asked to pay an environmental handling fee at this point in the legislative and regulatory progression of this new system, they really should not be paying that fee because it's to an organization that does not have a stewardship plan approved yet.

While the minister has indicated that he is not willing to provide advice to these businesses, I would note that businesses are looking to government for guidance as to how to deal with this new system. While he may be quick to dismiss them and suggest that he is not in a position to provide advice, I would suggest that somebody ought to be providing advice to these

businesses, because they are being asked to pay a fee and they don't understand why that fee is in place if this organization doesn't even have a stewardship plan approved under the Yukon government.

I will move on, because I don't think I'm going to get any more from this minister other than a re-reading of the legislative return that he tabled last week.

I will move on to the Fish and Wildlife management branch review. A simple question on this is: Why was the Yukon Outfitters Association not invited to participate in a review of that branch?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will endeavour to get this answer for the member opposite. Just to clarify because I think that there was some confusion as to who the member opposite was asking — why they were not included in the review. Was it the Yukon Fish and Game Association or — if I could have clarification.

Mr. Dixon: My question was: Why wasn't the Yukon Outfitters Association invited to participate in the review of the Fish and Wildlife management branch?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I believe that I did have an exchange with the Member for Kluane in the spring of this year on this topic.

ERM consultants, formerly known as Stratos, focused on the strengths of the Department of Environment's Fish and Wildlife branch in fulfilling its mandate, activities, and objectives and identified opportunities for improvement. Part of the mandate review required reviewing a set of 18 documents that summarize or inform the branch mandate, priorities, and activities.

For that reason, the consultant advised the branch to focus our engagement efforts on boards and councils that are mandated to work with Yukon government on the co-management of fish and wildlife in the Yukon. As a result, the invitation went to renewable resources councils, the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board, First Nation partners, and specific non-governmental organizations, which did include, I believe, the Yukon Conservation Society and the Yukon Fish and Game Association. The review examined and was informed by the branch mandate activities and objectives as established in Canadian and Yukon legislation and agreements, Indigenous agreements, ministerial mandate letters, and departmental strategic plans.

The Department of Environment meets frequently with the Yukon Outfitters Association and Yukon outfitters.

In 2023, the Yukon outfitter liaison committee, comprised of the representatives from the Department of Environment and Yukon Outfitters Association, met twice to discuss issues important to the industry. The most recent Yukon outfitter liaison committee occurred on June 13, 2024. The wildlife harvest biologists and other Fish and Wildlife branch staff also met regularly with individual Yukon outfitters as needed. Department of Environment is committed to continue to work collaboratively with the Yukon Outfitters Association and all outfitters.

As far as the scope of the mandate, the final report identified five areas of focus to support the Fish and Wildlife branch and work to effectively meet its mandate: to clarify and

create consistency in the branch's mandate; to take a strategic approach to mandate delivery; to develop an approach to support collective fish and wildlife management prioritization, collaboration among actors with responsibilities in the Yukon's fish and wildlife structure, and branch-level prioritization; to make technical information and analysis available to support transparency and decision-making; and to enhance approaches to collaborate with Indigenous governments as partners in the fish and wildlife structure.

Mr. Dixon: I will be sure to share that illuminating answer with the Yukon Outfitters Association as soon as I can.

I will move on to the issue of permitting of municipal solid-waste facilities and some answers that the minister provided yesterday that sparked some subsequent questions. Yesterday, the minister said that, in August, the Government of Yukon notified six municipalities and the Department of Community Services that adaptive management plans were required for their specific sites. That was, according to the minister, a result of groundwater monitoring data that had identified concerns and, in particular, surface-water or groundwater quality parameters exceeding regulatory limits. Can the minister tell us which six municipalities he is referring to and which sites belonging to the Department of Community Services exceeded their regulatory requirements?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I might have to get back to the member opposite with respect to the actual testing results, but as I said yesterday, the Government of Yukon notified six municipalities and the Department of Community Services that adaptive plans were required for their specific sites. The six municipal sites include: Watson Lake, Whitehorse, Teslin, Faro, Carmacks, and Haines Junction. The 14 Community Services sites include: Ross River, Braeburn, Burwash Landing, Carcross, Deep Creek, Horse Creek camp, Keno, Mount Lorne, Silver City, Johnsons Crossing, Marsh Lake, Pelly Crossing, Tagish, and Upper Liard.

Currently, the Site Assessment and Remediation Unit pays for water monitoring and well installation at the Community Services sites — those would be the 14 sites. As I think I also indicated yesterday, some additional resources may be required to fund the monitoring evaluation regulatory costs.

With respect to the specific questions on the readings — the water data — I will return to the House with a return as soon as practicable.

Mr. Dixon: Thanks to the minister for that list of communities. In the case of the municipally run solid-waste facilities, was the decision made to impose an adaptive management plan on these municipalities based on test results that the municipalities had submitted to the department, or were they collected independently by the department?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The decision was based on the semi-annual sampling that was conducted by the municipalities. They are required to conduct those samples under their permit.

Mr. Dixon: Is the requirement to complete an adaptive management plan for those six sites a condition of the solid-waste permit, or was it an additional regulatory imposition by the Department of Environment — post-permit being in place?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for the question. I am advised by officials that it is a condition of their permit as required through the contaminated sites regulation, and it was in their old permits as well. Based on the most current groundwater and surface-water quality data, six municipal solid-waste disposal facilities and 14 Community Services solid-waste disposal facilities now meet the triggers for an adaptive management plan as described in protocol 13 of the contaminated sites regulation, also known as CSR1. Protocol 13 outlines triggers for adaptive management in cases where exceedances of parameters have been identified multiple times over a two- to three-year period.

Mr. Dixon: I appreciate that from the minister. As I am sure that he can appreciate, any additional regulatory burden imposed on municipalities creates a significant cost, and that cost is of great concern to municipal governments who are cash-strapped and find it difficult to respond to such impositions by regulators like the Department of Environment. Would the Department of Environment consider paying for the increased monitoring that is required under adaptive management plans as they do for Community Services-run sites?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The approximate cost for developing adaptive management plans is in the range of \$25,000 to \$40,000 per plan. The shared costs of additional monitoring, well installation, and other actions set out in the plan cannot be quantified until adaptive plans are developed.

I think in my response yesterday — those will not be in place until at least the fall of 2025. I certainly don't disagree with the Leader of the Official Opposition — the member opposite — with respect to concerns that the municipalities of Watson Lake, Whitehorse, Teslin, Faro, Carmacks, and Haines Junction might have with respect to additional regulatory burden and potential financial burden. Certainly, the Department of Environment will be engaged in those talks over the course of the next year.

Generally speaking, as a regulator, the Department of Environment does not financially support permittees to meet conditions of an authorization — but don't disagree that this will represent a burden. The department will engage in those conversations over the course of the next year, but the priority must, of course, be the protection of groundwater and protection of the environment. This is solid science, but we certainly recognize that further discussions with respect to both regulatory and financial burdens will be had, but there is about a year before the landfill adaptive management plans would be implemented.

Mr. Dixon: Can the minister confirm that the Department of Environment pays for and conducts water monitoring at Community Services-run solid-waste facilities?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Yes, as I believe I said in my responses this afternoon, the Site Assessment and Remediation Unit pays for water monitoring and well installation at the Community Services sites; therefore, some additional resources might be required for SARU to continue their work.

I am also advised that the Department of Community Services is in discussions with the impacted communities with

respect to the ongoing concerns that they may have, but, yes, the answer to the question is that Community Services is in contact with respect to all 20 possibly impacted sites.

Mr. Dixon: I will briefly make the point that the department may bill itself as an independent regulator that doesn't get involved in the financial costs of its regulations, but it certainly does when it's regulating itself, as it is with government-run sites. That isn't lost on municipalities, so it is something for the minister to consider.

I will move on to a different regulatory issue, and that is something that the minister touched on yesterday as well, which is the air emissions permit for the Old Crow gasifier. The minister indicated that Community Services is operating the Old Crow solid-waste gasifier with an expired permit. Can he confirm that this is indeed the case?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Community Services has — as I think as I indicated yesterday — a draft update permit. The Department of Environment is working with Community Services to confirm that permit — the draft update permit — and yes, meanwhile, they are operating under the expired permit, which expired on December 31, 2023. Both permits allow for the gasifier to operate. There is no open burning allowed.

Our understanding is that Community Services has ceased open burning of waste in the community. Environment is planning an inspection in the next several weeks to confirm. Department of Environment is generally satisfied that Community Services is actively working toward re-permitting and is adhering to their expired waste permit by either using the gasifier or landfilling the solid waste when the gasifier is down.

Community Services has a short-term compliance plan, which Environment reviewed and agreed with. Community Services is working on a long-term compliance plan for the Department of Environment, due to the Department of Environment later this year.

To the best of our knowledge — the Department of Environment's knowledge — there is no open burning.

So, once again, Department of Environment is generally satisfied that Community Services is actively working toward re-permitting and is adhering to their expired waste permit by either using the gasifier or landfilling the solid waste when the gasifier is down.

Mr. Dixon: Did the minister just say that the Old Crow solid-waste permit is expired as well?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The solid-waste permit includes the air emissions authorization and it is a combination permit.

Mr. Dixon: So, the minister indicated that the air emissions permit was expired — those are the words he used earlier. So, is the solid-waste permit expired, or is it in good standing?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The solid-waste permit includes the air emission authorization, and it is a combination permit.

Mr. Dixon: And is it in good standing?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Community Services has a draft update permit — the combination permit — and meanwhile, they are operating under an expired permit that expired on December 31, 2023. Both permits allow for the gasifier to

operate. Our understanding once again is that Community Services has ceased open burning of waste in the community. Environment is planning an inspection in the next several weeks to confirm. Environment is generally satisfied that Community Services is actively working toward re-permitting and is adhering to their expired waste permit, which I understand is a combined permit, by either using the gasifier or landfilling of solid waste when the gasifier is down. Community Services has a short-term compliance plan, which the Department of Environment reviewed and agreed with. Community Services is working on a long-term compliance plan for the Department of Environment, due later this year. To the best of our knowledge, there is no open burning, and once again, the solid-waste permit includes the air emissions authorization and it is a combination permit. Officials from the Department of Environment continue to work with the Department of Community Services to consider options for alternative waste management practices and bring their operations back into compliance with the *Environment Act*.

Mr. Dixon: Again, I have to point out what seems to be a double standard for the operation of solid-waste facilities by the Yukon government as opposed to municipalities. I think that municipalities would be surprised to learn that Community Services is able to operate a solid-waste facility with an expired permit.

I will move on. Last spring, I understand that there was considerable flooding in Old Crow and that flooding caused flooding of the sewage lagoon. Has the department conducted any assessment with the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation as to the leakage of that lagoon into the Porcupine River? If so, what were the results?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Just a follow-up in relation to the prior question about creating a longer term compliance plan in Old Crow with Community Services, I think that it is important to note to Yukoners that the Department of Environment always works toward compliance through education and collaboration. We work with both Community Services and our municipal partners to ensure that the environment is protected but also that essential infrastructure is operational.

With respect to the question about the sewage lagoon in Old Crow, Environment staff have been in touch with first responders and EMO. They were in touch with first responders and EMO during the flood regarding water licence compliance. No spill was reported from the flooding, nor impact to the facility. However, an inspection by the Department of Environment personnel is also scheduled in the next few weeks.

Mr. Dixon: Can the minister confirm that there was no spill reported? Do I understand then that it is the understanding of the Department of Environment that there was no flooding of the lagoon and that none of the lagoon leaked into the Porcupine River?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will endeavour to absolutely confirm — my information is that no spill was reported from the flooding or impact to the facility. That is the information that I have today, but I can follow up to determine if there is any additional information available. Just to confirm: No spill was reported from the flooding.

Mr. Dixon: I will move on. It was reported on CBC in February 2023 that the Ross River Dena Council had submitted a proposal to the Canada nature fund, which is a body of the federal government, which was proposing an Indigenous protected area of approximately 41,000 square kilometres. What is the Yukon government's position on this proposal?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I did not get that question.

Mr. Dixon: In February of 2023, the CBC reported that the Ross River Dena Council submitted a proposal to the Canada nature fund, which is a body of the federal government, for the establishment of an Indigenous protected area in the Ross River area representing approximately 41,000 square kilometres. What is the Yukon government's position with regard to this proposal by the RRDC to Canada?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The nature agreement includes opportunities to support Indigenous leadership in conservation to enhance protection and recovery of species at risk and increase monitoring and knowledge of important wildlife populations and habitats.

The Indigenous-led conservation capacity fund was developed under the nature agreement and has awarded over \$2 million to seven Yukon First Nations, Inuvialuit, transboundary Indigenous governments, and groups to support conservation-related interests in their traditional territories or asserted territories.

Under the *Canada-Yukon Nature Agreement*, we have also reached a two-year funding agreement with the Council of Yukon First Nations.

With respect to the potential IPCA — Indigenous protected and conserved area — of the Ross River Dena Council, the 41,000 kilometres that have been identified for possible conservation, the lead negotiation with the Ross River Dena Council and by extension with Canada is occurring through the Executive Council Office and Aboriginal Relations.

Chair: Is there any further general debate on Vote 52, Department of Environment?

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

Mr. Dixon: Madam Chair, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, cleared or carried, as required.

Unanimous consent re deeming all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, cleared or carried

Chair: The Member for Copperbelt North has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 52, Department of Environment, 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 \$2,478,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures
Total Capital Expenditures underexpenditure in the amount of \$600,000 agreed to

Total Expenditures in the amount of \$1,878,000 agreed to
Department of Environment agreed to

Chair: The matter now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 54, Department of Tourism and Culture, 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.

The matter now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Vote 54, Department of Tourism and Culture, in Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*.

Request for Acting Chair of Committee of the Whole

Chair: At this time, I will ask if there is a volunteer so that I can participate in debate.

Member for Takhini-Kopper King rises

Department of Tourism and Culture — continued

Acting Chair (Ms. White): Is there any further debate on the Department of Tourism and Culture?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I am just going to reintroduce the folks from Tourism and Culture here. Kate Olynyk is our Assistant Deputy Minister of Strategic Initiatives. Also, Deputy Minister Sierra van der Meer is here, whose birthday it is, so happy birthday to her. She was suggesting that maybe we would be able to clear things. I think that is not very likely. I am going to take my seat and I hope to get a few questions in today.

Ms. Van Bibber: Welcome also to the staff and the deputy minister — happy birthday.

I will get a couple of quick questions in hopefully before we adjourn today. I wanted to ask a question that I had asked recently in Question Period about the progression of the convention centre. I know that the minister said that this was his first and his second priority in tourism.

Can the minister give us an update on where the project is at the moment and the next steps? Can he also provide information on how this project will be funded and who the main partners are in the venture?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: First of all, it's Chu Níikwān Limited Partnership that is progressing with their proposal. They have brought to us their design. The price range for the design is in the \$65-million to \$90-million-plus range, so that is the range. We are in conversation with the federal government about how both the capital costs might be addressed and ongoing operating costs. There is a range of possibilities there, and that dialogue is underway now that Chu Níikwān has given us their design.

Ms. Van Bibber: Could the minister give us a timeline on this project? When is the expectation of an answer from the feds, and also, is O&M considered in this project at some point?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Once the funding is in place, we think that it's roughly a two-year buildout, so two full building seasons to complete the project.

The real question in terms of timeline is that next step that we're working on, which is around the funding package for the project. I don't have a timeline on that, but I can say that we're heavily into that dialogue as we speak.

Ms. Van Bibber: I thank the minister for that answer.

As we know, the new welcome to Yukon signage just went up this year, and there was much discussion and debate and likes and dislikes of the signs at our borders. Could the minister give us a total budget for the welcome signs, even to set up?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The total project cost was just under \$550,000. All of the signs are up; they went up this summer, by the way. I know that there were some folks who expressed some concerns, but can I just say as well that we got a tremendous amount of positive feedback. One of the other things that we got was — this is this opportunity to try to showcase local art, and we formed these four different subcommittees to talk about the signs sort of in the southeast Yukon and the southwest of the Yukon, in the west, and the north. So, I thought it was really well done.

The breakdown of the \$550,000 or just under \$550,000 was \$133,000 for design, \$350,000 for fabrication, \$55,000 roughly on the call for art, and about \$5,000 in supporting those groups to do the artwork selection, and then there was about another \$5,000 or so that went toward promotional material around it, like postcards and stickers and things that we give out at our visitor information centre. So, that's the breakdown.

Ms. Van Bibber: Was the installation included in that price — yes?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: When I said the \$350,000 for fabrication, I should have said "fabrication and installation". It was a local company, Hvactech, which won the bid — Hvactech Systems — to fabricate and install the signs this summer.

Ms. Van Bibber: In the \$133,000 that was quoted for the design work, can the minister explain to us why the design work was sole-sourced to a company in Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The original call around the design call was a request for qualifications in December 2019. It was a competitive process that led to the company being selected. There was subsequent work that we used them again on, but it was a competitive bid process.

Ms. Van Bibber: Thank you for that answer. Can the minister explain why the decision was made to just have one-sided signs? Are there any plans to put something on the back of them as you are coming up to the back of the sign?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: There have been lots of discussions going on about the backs of the signs. In some of the locations, really, the signs don't back onto much. They back onto a forest or something like that, so there is not as much real estate there.

But on some of the signs, they are seen on the backside. You can think of the airport as an example, but lots of them have approaches to the back. So, yes, there has been conversation happening within the department about how to utilize the back of that sign.

I think one of the ways that we're talking about is — and we've always sort of been talking about how to get more information to visitors about the Yukon but also about that location and that place — certainly about the artists who are there and their artwork that is shown.

I think we've talked about having things where you have references to the past signs and things like that.

The way that the department talks to me about it is that you put a little bit of information and then you put a QR code, because most people nowadays have phones. They scan the image of the QR code and then get more information, and it also then links to tourism assets nearby or opportunities nearby and things like that. So, there's a way in which we can really utilize that white space. There has been quite a bit of conversation about that. I think that the plan generally is to do that next summer. The department has been working on it.

I will sit down and see if we have time for one more question. We will see.

Ms. Van Bibber: Maybe even a “Thank you for visiting Yukon” on the back would be better than nothing.

When was the last TV ad done, and are there any plans for expenditures this year? If so, how much is planned in the budget for expenditures for TV ads?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I will make sure to ask our marketing department or get some extra information before I rise next, but I did see some last year and I did also see that ad that we had called “The Yukon: It's a Little Bit Metal”. That one played, so I think we'll see some more of that this year, because it really has been pretty popular and has drawn a lot of interest from potential travellers to our shoulder seasons and our winter.

Seeing the time, Madam Acting Chair, I move that you report progress.

Acting 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.

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

Chair's report

Acting Chair: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 215, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2024-25*, and directed me to report progress.

Speaker: You have heard the report from the Acting 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 5:27 p.m.

The following document was filed November 5, 2024:

35-1-278

2023-2024 Annual Report on the Implementation Plan for Yukon's Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls and Two-Spirit+ People Strategy for Changing the Story to Uphold Dignity and Justice and summary (McLean)