



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 89

1st Session

35th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, November 2, 2022 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Jeremy Harper

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2022 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 — Emily Tredger, MLA, Whitehorse Centre

CABINET MINISTERS

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

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
Emily Tredger	Third Party House Leader Whitehorse Centre
Annie Blake	Vuntut Gwitchin

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, November 2, 2022 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Introduction of visitors.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I would like to ask my colleagues here in the Legislative Assembly to welcome a number of individuals who are gathered with us today for our tribute — always a favourite tribute here — to Yukoner Appreciation Week.

I would like to start by welcoming those who represent business chambers — Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce, Yukon Chamber of Commerce — Andrei Samson, who is the executive director for the Whitehorse chamber; Trevor Mead-Robins, first vice-chair; Joel Gaetz, treasurer; Allison Camenzuli, who is the chair. As well, Anne Lewis is here, on behalf of many different groups, but probably the Yukon Chamber of Commerce, as well.

From the Department of Economic Development, I would like to welcome some of our team, who do fantastic work: Elsie Jordan, Brian Park, Samson Hartland, as well as Damian Topps and Lisa Eddy.

Thank you all for coming in today for our tribute.

Applause

Hon. Ms. McLean: I would ask my colleagues to help me welcome two guests for our tribute on National Skilled Trade and Technology Week: Gerry Quarton and Samantha Hand from Skills Canada. Thank you for being here.

Applause

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I will ask my colleagues to help me welcome two guests today for the ministerial statement. We can welcome Amy Cooper, who is the acting supervisor of withdrawal management with the Department of Health and Social Services, and Patsy Williams, who is an assistant with the Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services at the department. Thank you both for being here.

Applause

Speaker: Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of Yukoner Appreciation Week

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I rise today on behalf of the Yukon Liberal government to pay tribute to Yukoner Appreciation Week. Yukoner Appreciation Week is an annual event hosted

by the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce which features local businesses and organizations offering customers and clients discounts, prizes, and fun activities.

Today marks the kickoff event, which started at 10:00 a.m. — I was told — with a lineup, as the team showed up this morning, and runs through until 7:00 p.m. at the Old Fire Hall with hourly draws, live music from Annie Avery, and catering from Crêperie La Petite Maison. This is an excellent time for locals to celebrate the Yukon's businesses while benefiting from great deals and the possibility of winning some incredible prizes.

The event this year includes the reintroduction of the popular passport contest in which Yukoners can collect stamps from participating locations and enter to win one of the six shopping spree prizes.

Yukoner Appreciation Week is often seen as the beginning of the holiday season, providing a great opportunity to get your gift shopping done while reconnecting with the community.

Every November, there are new businesses to discover and familiar shops with unexplored additions, and it is truly an excellent time to check up on all your favourite establishments. I invite all Yukoners to take advantage of this occasion and show their support for the participating businesses. This year, there are over 50 participating. I think the number is almost up to 80 businesses that are there right now — 80 businesses offering savings and providing stamps to locals across a variety of sectors, including food and drink establishments, retail, accommodation, and many more.

We have so many fantastic business owners here in the Yukon, and I am happy to see many of them participating in Yukoner Appreciation Week.

Yukoners prioritize shopping local, and this event is all about those businesses giving back to the community while promoting their services. So, get out and show your support for our local businesses this Yukoner Appreciation Week, on now until November 5.

For Yukoners in the communities, for those travelling throughout the Yukon for work or pleasure, I would encourage you to take a few moments to support local businesses around the territory in the lead-up to the holidays. I know that when travelling through the communities, I never miss the chance to stop in one of Yukon's hidden gems, such as the Tatchun Centre General Store in Carmacks — you can find everything there — as well as the Nisutlin Trading Post or the Yukon Motel in Teslin.

So, again, I would like to thank the Yukon Chamber of Commerce and their board for once again coordinating these festivities, as well as participating businesses for their contributions to the community.

Applause

Mr. Hassard: I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize Yukoner Appreciation Week. This is a homegrown event that is organized yearly by the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce. Every year is an opportunity for businesses to say thank you to Yukoners for their loyalty and patronage. This wonderful event has really

grown over the years. This year, Mr. Speaker, Yukoner Appreciation Week takes place from November 2 through November 5, and I believe it has over 90 participating locations — businesses and restaurants alike. Once again, Yukoners can pick up a passport to have it stamped at different locations as they browse for a chance to win some great prizes. As the minister said, the kickoff has begun, taking place at the Old Fire Hall until 7:00 p.m. tonight, with live music and snacks and to pick up your passports.

So, visit your favourite stores, check out the deals, enter some draws, support your local community, and get those passports. Support your local businesses that work so hard to give back to our community. We have so many incredible businesses across this wonderful territory. Many of these began as a dream or an idea that came to life only because of the support from their community.

These businesses provide jobs, support our local sports teams, and give back to the communities in so many ways. Many faced extreme hardships over the last couple of years through the pandemic, and we saw closures due to financial constraints and staff shortages. All businesses had to adapt to the new restrictions, and they all did all they could to keep their doors open.

We have all heard the term “buy local”, especially over the last couple of years as Yukoners rallied to support their local businesses to keep the money within the local economy. Buying local is just as important today in all of our communities as many are still working to get their feet back under them.

So, thank you to each of the participating businesses and organizations for all you do year long, and thank you to the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce for your efforts in organizing this great community event.

Applause

Ms. Tredger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Yukon NDP to celebrate Yukoner Appreciation Week. Local businesses support the Yukon. Just try to find an event, sports team, or performance that doesn't have sponsorship from a local Yukon business. They support Yukoners and Yukoners support them.

It wasn't that long ago that everything from commercial flights to a glass of orange juice was much more expensive in the Yukon than down south. Committed local business owners have worked harder over the years to bring these costs down. Many places price-match southern vendors, and it has made the Yukon a more affordable place to live.

The Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce is making supporting local businesses extra easy this week, and I have to say that they have really outdone themselves this year: There are draw prizes; there are discounts; free gifts with purchases; “buy one, get one” deals; entire stores on sale; free admissions; and even games with prizes. You won't find better deals to do your Christmas shopping.

It used to be just a Yukoner Appreciation Day and, a few years back, it was expanded to be a whole week. A whole week is wonderful, but I also want to encourage Yukoners to shop local not just this week, but every week. My riding of

Whitehorse Centre is home to many, many businesses, and a lot of them have had a tough couple of years. Between COVID, the labour shortage, and rising prices on goods and services, it has been a struggle to be a business owner lately. Our vibrant local businesses help to make the Yukon the wonderful place it is, and we need to support them through these tough times as best as we can.

So, we can't wait to get out there and enjoy the specials this week, and we encourage all Yukoners to do the same.

Applause

In recognition of National Skilled Trade and Technology Week

Hon. Ms. McLean: I rise on behalf of our Yukon Liberal government to pay tribute and recognition to National Skilled Trade and Technology Week that runs from October 30 to November 5. This week is dedicated to promoting and increasing awareness of the many career opportunities that exist in skilled trades and technologies.

Pursuing a career in trades or technology is an excellent opportunity for many young Yukoners. I'm happy to report that, as of October 1, 2022, Yukon has 456 apprentices registered, including 117 who have identified as First Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we sometimes take for granted the work that happens behind the scenes. When the power goes out, the power line technicians restore it for us. Thanks to talented network system administrators, we can use technology to work across geographical locations. Without construction tradespeople, we would not be able to build our homes, schools, and hospitals.

It is important that we continue to encourage our youth to learn more about trades and technology. I wanted to take the time to thank everyone who has played such a large part in supporting our youth to explore different avenues. Thank you to Skills Yukon, which supports our youth through school programming, mentorship, and unwavering support. Thank you to Yukon University, which is offering accessible opportunities and introductions to the trades. Thank you to Yukon Women in Trades and Technology for providing local youth with hands-on experiences and incredible mentorship. Thank you to the Apprentice Advisory Board, a group of employers and employees who work within the trades to provide valuable insights and advice to Yukon government. Thank you to the Department of Education's apprenticeship and trades certification unit staff. Finally, we would not be able to successfully train apprentices in any trade without the private sector; thank you for supporting this aspect of trades training.

I have a personal connection in my life to tradespeople who are in my life. My husband started out his career as a red seal welder. My oldest son is a red seal electrician, and many of my other family members are red seal carpenters, mechanics, welders, electricians, technicians, and chefs.

So, let us remember to take a moment to express our gratitude to our local tradespeople within our communities and recognize their incredible contributions. From all of us on this side of the floor, thank you for your continuous efforts.

Applause

Ms. Clarke: I'm pleased to rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to recognize October 31 to November 6 as National Skilled Trade and Technology Week.

This week, we recognize all those who have developed and honed the skills for success in their respective trades. SkillsCompétences Canada reports that over 700,000 skilled workers across Canada will be retiring by 2029. As students move from high school into these different positions in the trades, they will be helping to fill the very large gap of experience and expertise that would otherwise be felt throughout the country.

It takes time to build a strong workforce — years of training and years of experience. There are currently 56 red seal trades in Canada, and we are fortunate to have in-territory training opportunities for many of them. I would like to thank Skills Canada Yukon for the work they do in the territory to showcase the different trades to youth and help them to build career foundations.

Throughout the last year, Skills Canada Yukon delivered over 100 workshops to Yukon youth, either in person or virtually. They were dedicated to our youth despite the challenges brought on by the pandemic. Thank you and congratulations on your 25th anniversary in the territory, which I understand is happening in the coming year.

I would also like to give special mention to Yukon Women in Trades and Technology, which is celebrating 22 years in the Yukon this year. This incredible organization helps to encourage girls and women to get into trades and technology fields and also to help provide a safe and productive environment for them when they get there. These organizations do amazing work to provide awareness, information, hands-on training, and support to many.

I understand that SkillsCompétences Canada is among the list of exhibitors in the 2022 education, career, and volunteer expo, as it returns in person. They will be in attendance along with representatives from a number of local organizations, businesses, and I understand a number of colleges and universities. That should be a great opportunity for those looking at education and career options.

I want to congratulate all participants in this year's territorial skills and Skills Canada national competitions, and a big congratulations to Lucas Henderson and Connor Kaszycki for the wins at the national competition. Thank you to all our red seal and other fully certified tradespeople, apprentices, and all those with dreams and aspirations to find careers in trades and tech.

Applause

Ms. White: As a tradesperson, it is a pleasure to stand on behalf of the Yukon NDP caucus in celebration of this year's National Skilled Trade and Technology Week.

The world as we know it wouldn't exist without tradespeople. Over the next five years, Canada will need over 256,000 new apprentices to meet the growing demand for skilled trades in the country. With no less than 56 recognized trades in Canada, there is a trade for anyone who is interested

and excited about this kind of work. Trades are a rewarding way to earn a living, and you get to see your skills truly make something happen.

Yukon has made leaps and bounds in the arena of skilled trades and technology since I was young. Organizations like Skills Canada Yukon and Yukon Women in Trades and Technology have sprouted, grown, and expanded. Through their outreach and hands-on approach, they are opening doors for Yukon youth toward exciting careers. Looking back at the past year, even with dealing with the effects of a global pandemic, Skills Canada Yukon delivered over 100 workshops to Yukon youth, either via virtual methods or in person, and distributed countless DIY kits across the territory.

This coming year promises to be a big one for Skills Canada as they celebrate 25 years in the territory. YWITT had another successful year with both their power program for youth and their adult programming. All of this hard work to get folks interested in the trades can even continue right here at Yukon University, where they offer classes for seven ticketed trades and a handful of other trades-related courses.

In Canada's current and future economy, the skilled trades are going to matter more than ever, so let's do our part to support the tradespeople of tomorrow.

Applause

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Speaker: Under Tabling Returns and Documents, the Chair has for tabling the 2021-22 annual report of the Yukon Child and Youth Advocate Office, entitled *Upping Your Game on Children's Rights*.

Are there any further returns or documents for tabling?

Hon. Ms. McLean: I have for tabling today three legislative returns from questions brought forward by opposition members.

Mr. Istchenko: I have for tabling a letter from the Wilderness Tourism Association of the Yukon, dated October 24. It is to the Minister of Tourism and Culture and the Minister of Environment, referencing the *Animal Protection and Control Act*.

Speaker: Are there any reports of committees? Petitions.

PETITIONS

Petition No. 15 — received

Clerk: Mr. Speaker and honourable members of the Assembly, I have had the honour to review a petition, being Petition No. 15 of the First Session of the 35th Legislative Assembly, as presented by the Member for Whitehorse Centre on November 1, 2022.

The petition presented by the Member for Whitehorse Centre meets the requirements as to form of the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

Speaker: Accordingly, I declare Petition No. 15 is deemed to be read and received. Pursuant to Standing Order 67, the Executive Council shall provide a response to a petition which has been read and received within eight sitting days of its presentation. Therefore, the Executive Council response to Petition No. 15 shall be provided on or before November 15, 2022.

Are there any petitions to be presented?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motions?

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

THAT this House urges the Minister of Health and Social Services to make public the criteria that will be used to assess and prioritize people who apply to be a patient at the government's new Constellation Health Centre so that Yukoners can better understand whether it is worth their time to apply to be a patient.

Mr. Istchenko: I rise in the House today to give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Canada to remove the GST on home heating fuel, residential electricity bills, and freight bills for the transportation of essential goods and services.

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

THAT it is the opinion of this House that education workers in Ontario should retain their right to strike.

I also give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House supports the repeal of section 43 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*.

Speaker: Is there a statement by a minister?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Patient journey mapping

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today on behalf of the Yukon Liberal government to speak about a new program to help improve Yukon's health care system. Since declaring the substance use health emergency in January, Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services has been using patient journey mapping as part of our outreach efforts with Yukoners who use substances.

Journey mapping tracks an individual's health care interactions and gathers helpful feedback about how they are experiencing care.

When someone is willing to share their experience, they meet with two Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services team members. The individual describes their experiences connecting services, as well as their detailed thoughts, emotions, perceptions, and any suggestions for improvements. Details of the experience are shared with a program analyst who creates a one-page visual representation of the journey.

This visual map indicates how a person's journey has been and quickly shows how services and communication can be improved for them and for others. Through patient journey maps, we have identified that clients were sometimes unable to access services at key times and that, at times, they felt staff should have been more responsive to their needs. We have heard that patients feel empowered, that they are grateful to be able to provide such direct, meaningful feedback, and that they found the journey-mapping process very rewarding.

Journey mapping gives health care providers a detailed, honest look at an individual's experience and point of view, as they seek, receive, and continue their care. Journey maps can show where patients have gone for help, what interactions and care they have received, and where they have experienced barriers or gaps.

Journey maps can also show where patients' interactions with providers were positive and supportive. Journey mapping provides a voice for Yukoners who access health care services so that together we can identify opportunities for improvement and find solutions for issues.

One of the most important aspects of these journey maps is to highlight where communication between service providers can be improved. They cover all stages of the health care journey from awareness of symptoms, or a need for care, to the consideration of options, diagnosis, treatment, post-treatment, and recovery processes. Particularly for Yukoners who use substances and seek support, journey mapping shows the interconnectedness of different departments, services, and supports and, of course, other governments, non-governmental organizations, communities, and families.

An increased understanding of how Yukoners access services from different departments, facilities, and organizations helps us develop a more seamless experience for people who use substances. We will use this information to deliver more personal, improved experiences and increase overall satisfaction for patients and health care providers alike.

Thank you to those who have shared their stories with our team, and thank you to our dedicated service providers for conducting this important outreach and engagement with Yukoners.

Mr. Cathers: While we are pleased to hear that this specific program is having some success, we continue to hear concerns from people across the Yukon about challenges getting access to mental health support and addictions treatment. Since declaring a substance use emergency in January, we have seen a troubling lack of action by this government in doing something that should be a high priority: expanding addictions treatment programs, including increasing the capacity of addictions treatment, making addictions treatment and mental health programming more available in communities, and improving after-care.

We hope to see the government take action to expand both mental health programming and addictions treatment services to help Yukoners who need the support to break free of any substance addictions that they have, overcome mental health challenges, and live happy and healthy lives.

Ms. Blake: Patient journey mapping is critical to providing quality mental health care to Yukoners. I want to thank the people who are working on the ground to close major gaps in the health care system with this project. I am hopeful that this means the Yukoners who have the courage to ask for help will get the care they need, instead of navigating a patchwork system alone.

Unfortunately, many Yukoners continue to fall through the cracks in our health care system. In every role I have worked in, I have seen how the current patchwork system has left people behind. People without family doctors are left to wait for hours in the ER for basic mental health care. They don't get the safety and comfort of having a relationship with one provider. Instead, they see a rotating list of different doctors every visit. For people in communities, access to care is even worse. When they seek help at the health centres, they are often sent to Whitehorse to go to the ER, only to be discharged with no plan in place. Then they are told to return to their community, where they continue to suffer. I have seen the cycle repeat itself many times over.

Just last year, a Yukoner wrote in *The Globe and Mail* about going to the ER in Whitehorse when they were in crisis, and instead of getting help, they were dangerously medicated and discharged into the cold, with no socks and no way to get home. These are real experiences that we have heard directly from Yukoners. Patient mapping is a real opportunity for the government's Mental Wellness and Substance Use centre to work with the Hospital Corporation and community health centres to address the gaps that I have shared.

What plans does the minister have to increase mental health services through the Dawson City and Watson Lake hospitals? Communities have highlighted the need for more mental health nurses practising in their communities. Does the minister plan to act on these calls and hire more mental health nurses? What work is the minister doing with the non-insured health benefits program to ensure that barriers to access, like costs, are removed for Yukoners who need mental health care? Can the minister tell Yukoners how her government is working with Yukon First Nations and communities on this project? Only when this government sits down at the table with all of these partners will Yukoners get the quality of mental health care they deserve. I look forward to the minister's response. Mahsi'.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I certainly want to make it clear — I will address some of the questions that have been brought up by the opposition, but I am here today to hold up this amazing new program and the skilled experts who do this work with those of lived experience and help us change and improve Yukon's health care system in that way. Our government is taking action to respond to the substance use health emergency absolutely every day.

Just yesterday, we announced a new joint initiative with the Yukon RCMP to launch Car 867. Car 867 will be staffed by a police officer and a mental health nurse from the Yukon government's Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services

unit and will respond to calls for service related to mental health issues and suicide risks. By integrating police response and trained mental health nurses, we will be able to better respond to urgent situations and lead to better outcomes for everyone involved.

We have held two mental wellness summits to connect with community health partners and Yukoners across the territory to align our work to increase harm-reduction initiatives, to promote well-being, and to save lives. We absolutely need to work together at all levels across the territory and beyond to address this emergency. At those summits, we have talked about our ongoing work to expand safer supply of opioids here in the territory, including communities outside of Whitehorse.

Another one of the many initiatives that is saving lives and helping Yukoners who are struggling with substance use is the supervised consumption site. A new room was added to the facility in May of this year to support inhalation. The site can now offer inhalation, oral, intranasal, and injection methods of consumption, one of only three such sites in the country. The Yukon supervised consumption site is one of the first indoor facilities in Canada to support inhalation as a way to help reduce harm among people who use drugs. As I have said, it's only one of three in Canada to offer indoor inhalation as a method of consumption.

We have taken the most progressive steps in the history of the territory to advance harm-reduction approaches. We continue to work with our partners at all levels to continue this absolutely vital work. I want to thank our Mental Wellness and Substance Use Services staff, physicians, hospital staff, community members, as well First Nation, municipal, and federal partners that are all working with us to address the substance use health emergency here in the territory.

Speaker: This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Atlin hydro expansion project costs

Mr. Hassard: The territory is in an energy crisis, and the Liberals have staked Yukon's energy future on the Atlin hydro expansion project. In 2019, the Yukon Energy Corporation conducted a study that estimated the cost of this project at \$120.7 million. In the corporation's 10-year energy strategy from 2020, that projected cost had increased to \$131 million. Then, in December 2020, the corporation told this Legislature that the cost had increased to \$200 million. Finally, the minister told this House last week that the cost had now skyrocketed to \$315 million. So, in short, this project has gone \$194 million over its original budget in just three years.

So, Mr. Speaker, why is this project so far overbudget?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Well, I'll be sure to ask the Tlingit Homeland Energy Limited Partnership, which is the First Nation development corporation that is working on this project, about those costs. I appreciate that costs have gone up. They have everywhere around the country. This is still a good project. I think that it's before the Yukon Utilities Board right

now for the energy purchase agreement. I'm sorry to hear that the Yukon Party doesn't support Atlin hydro.

I will be sure to ask the Tlingit Homeland Energy Limited Partnership about their costs and why they have risen. Overall, I think that it is just inflation due to infrastructure projects. But I will say that I still believe this is an incredibly important project for the Yukon, and I would like to thank the Government of Canada, the Government of British Columbia — and on behalf of the Yukon government — for their investment in this project.

Mr. Hassard: So, Mr. Speaker, a project that started out with an estimated cost of \$120.7 million three years ago is now estimated at \$315 million today — nearly two and a half times its original cost in just three years. That's \$194 million overbudget, Mr. Speaker.

So, can the minister responsible for this mess tell us if he is concerned with the trajectory of this project?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I'm disappointed to hear the members opposite refer to the First Nation-led project as a "mess". I think that's not something that I would like to say to them. They are welcome, of course, to talk to the Taku River Tlingit and say that they don't believe in this project. We do. We think that it is a solid project; it's going to provide energy for Yukoners at about 14 cents a kilowatt hour — a little under — and that's winter energy. That's a very good project for us. I think it's a strong project, and I'm happy that we're investing in it.

I am happy to say that the federal government is also investing — and the British Columbia government. We think that this is a good project for energy for the Yukon, and it's much, much better than the Yukon Party's plan to build an LNG plant for the Yukon.

Mr. Hassard: So, here is what we know. The project is going to cost almost \$200 million more than the Liberals originally told Yukoners, so the next question is: Where is the money coming from?

The latest publicly available information indicates that, between the federal government, the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and governments of Yukon and BC, the project is still not fully funded, years after it was announced. In fact, even with all the funding partners, there is still a \$133-million gap — what has been committed and what the new price tag is.

Can the minister tell us where the \$133 million is going to come from?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: There is a funding gap, and as I rose to speak to this subject in Committee of the Whole — I will check the record, but I'm pretty sure that I said it was \$60 million — the gap that exists. The members opposite are inflating that price by more than double — that's proven unreliable by the Yukon Party.

This work is a very good project for the Yukon, and we will continue to support the First Nation of the Taku River Tlingit and also their partnership with the Carcross/Tagish First Nation. We believe that this is good, to invest in renewable energy. The members opposite would have us investing in fossil fuels, the price of which is also going up.

Question re: Atlin hydro expansion project costs

Mr. Kent: The Liberals have staked our energy future on the Atlin hydro project and, as we have just heard, that project is now ridiculously overbudget. Not only that, but the project doesn't even have all the necessary funding, and it sounds like the Liberals have no clue where all the extra money is coming from.

What makes this more concerning are the comments made to the Legislature by the president of the Yukon Energy Corporation about this government's plans to deal with the energy crisis facing our territory. He said — and I'll quote: "I think our plan A right now is very much focused on making these projects happen, which again boils down to ... with Atlin securing the required funding."

So, Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals have so far failed with plan A, what is their plan B?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The Atlin project is a very important project. I appreciate the member quoting the president of the Yukon Development Corporation and Yukon Energy Corporation when they were here. Just a reminder, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Yukon Party that decided to say no to having those same witnesses appear here this spring and said, "No, thank you. We don't want to hear from them."

Well, I'm glad that they are interested now. I'm also glad that they are taking an interest in the Atlin project, although I'm very concerned that they have called it "ridiculously overbudget" and a "mess." This project is being led by the Taku River Tlingit First Nation. My work with the Taku River Tlingit First Nation has been very productive, very professional. I think that they have got a great project. It's a brownfield project. It's going to supply us winter energy. We are working to secure the funding. We are supporting them in securing that funding. We will continue to do that good work on behalf of Yukoners.

Mr. Kent: So, let's move on to the timelines. The electricity purchase agreement for the Atlin hydro project indicates that completion and commercial operation of the project is set for October 2024. Considering that the project is way overbudget and still underfunded by over \$100 million, can the minister confirm if the project will be completed on time?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: You know, I'm not sure — I stood a moment ago and I said that the funding gap was \$60 million. I said that in the last week or so, and yet the member opposite just — again, proven unreliable — exaggerated and inflated the cost here in the House by 66-and-two-thirds percent. It's not appropriate. We should be talking about the facts as being presented.

I think that it is also important to note that the energy purchase agreement that's before the Yukon Utilities Board is to purchase this electricity at 13.7 cents per kilowatt hour. That is incredibly affordable for Yukoners. That's what we are working to do to make sure that life is affordable for Yukoners. That's important work. We will continue to invest in this project.

Mr. Kent: So, the funding was based on what we have publicly available for us, and the timelines were set out in the

electricity purchase agreement. The minister didn't answer whether or not the project will be completed on time.

Let's sum up the Liberal government's plan A for the territory's energy future: It's overbudget, it's underfunded, and it's late. This does not really inspire confidence. According to the electricity purchase agreement, the Yukon government had to give notice by June 14 of this year that they were satisfied with the financial viability of the project.

Can the minister responsible confirm whether or not he is satisfied with the financial viability of this project?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: If we are talking about information publicly available, how about Hansard? I stood in this Legislature and I gave the response of the funding gap being \$60 million. Obviously, the members opposite are not willing to believe me — that's fine. We invited the Development Corporation and the Energy Corporation folks to come in. They declined to have that in.

The information that I have is that the project is on track for 2024. There is still work going on to get it there. The lead of the project is our First Nation whose traditional territory comes into the Yukon. We think this is an excellent opportunity for First Nations to invest in energy infrastructure, which will give great advantage to the Yukon. Certainly, we are behind this project.

Question re: Yukon nominee program

Ms. White: On a day when everyone has stood to recognize the importance of local business, let's talk about how we can better support those very same businesses. Across Canada, businesses are experiencing some of the worst staffing shortages the country has ever seen. In the Yukon, small businesses have been halting plans for expansion, reducing hours, and, in some cases, closing their doors altogether.

One avenue small businesses have is the Yukon nominee program. This allows them to broaden their search for staff, sponsoring non-citizens to work in the Yukon so they can lend us their skills and knowledge and help our economy grow.

Will the minister tell us how many applications are currently open under the Yukon nominee program, the average wait time for processing, and how many Yukon businesses have identified a need to use this program?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Thank you to the Leader of the Third Party for bringing an important issue to the Legislative Assembly today. Again, I want to thank the members from the immigration unit in the Department of Economic Development. They have been key drivers in ensuring that we have a lot of new folks who have made our territory a culturally richer place to live, but also have been key in ensuring that this economy — which, of course, has been leading the nation over the last number of years — continues to move forward.

Yes, we have had a series of challenges when it comes to some of our processing times. I think that it is important to say that the team within the immigration unit has done an extraordinary job of making sure that they process applications, but there is another step, and the next step of that is that it goes to the federal government — to the department, IRCC, which is Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada.

So, at this point in time — I believe, but I will come back to the House if the numbers are incorrect — I think that we had 250 applications that we were waiting — and this has been a challenge across the country, both provincially and territorially — on getting those approved. It is that backlog that happened throughout the last two years of COVID at the federal level. So, again, I think that it is at 250, and I will do my best to answer the other questions for number 2 and number 3.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that answer.

So, I know lots of people who have come to the Yukon through the nominee program. Many of them have gone on to be entrepreneurs themselves and sponsored their own employees. Folks who have come through the nominee program are important members of our community, especially when they decide to stay. Unfortunately, businesses need staff now, but sponsoring workers can be needlessly complicated, and every sole mistake adds time onto the process. Immigration is currently experiencing huge backlogs, and as it is with so many government programs, the smallest mistake in the application form can end in even longer delays.

Will the minister tell us how this government is supporting businesses through the application process for the Yukon nominee program?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Just a bit of background information — again, the immigration unit continues to monitor all of our current nominees, and that is a question that we have had, and it really just highlights — the question from the NDP previously — and it really has to do with agreements that we have in place with businesses — the tripartite agreements.

So, I think that it is important to just focus on the fact that we have existing nominees who are here. We have been using all of our allotments. We are up to 300 in this past year — just over 300 — and we continue to monitor, but at the same time, when businesses come to us — and I know that members of the Third Party have reached out to me on occasion, as well as the Official Opposition. The team at Economic Development are extremely active in helping businesses, and so when we see somebody who is interested in using the nominee program, we try to make sure that staff reach out. They sit down with those individuals, and they help them through that process.

Yes, there is documentation and paperwork that has to be undertaken. We have to ensure that the workers who are coming here are treated respectfully and that they are well looked after. Again, I think the team does a very good job in that work. Unless there has been something I have missed, I think that the Department of Economic Development has always been there to help businesses go through these types of applications and processes.

Ms. White: What we believe is that there really is an opportunity to do more. We have been hearing from Yukon business owners who are in the process of sponsoring nominees, but they have been having a difficult time navigating the process. Timelines are already months long, and let's face it, most business owners are not immigration specialists. The Yukon depends on these businesses, and the businesses depend on staff.

The application process for any type of immigration is complex and can have real consequences for both the business and the person who is being sponsored. One thing that we have been told is that small businesses currently don't feel supported through the process. We understand that there are good people in the department trying to help businesses navigate the system, but what folks applying for these programs really want and need is hands-on help with the paperwork.

Will the minister open a position within his department to help businesses by giving direct, hands-on support filling in the complex paperwork that comes with a nominee application?

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Look, when we are thinking about immigration and these processes, first of all, we are very forward-looking. We are understanding; we are seeing the trend of where we are in the labour market. This government has always been solutions-based, so yes, if there is a challenge, we go back and we take a look at that, and we have a track record of being able to do this type of work. Of course, this is how we operate, and that's how, specifically our team at Economic Development, has always operated, but let's just put a couple of facts on the table.

At this particular time, we have used all of our allotments for this year. It's just over 300, and we don't find out in the Yukon — or the PTs, the provinces and territories — their new allotment numbers until the first quarter of 2023. We will have to wait to hear, and that is something that the Yukon was very vocal about and was a leader at the table with all ministers across this country earlier this year. I commend our staff for getting ready for the intervention that we did.

If there is a particular case and people feel that they are unsupported, then please send them our way. There are private sector folks and consultants across the Yukon who also do this work. They help private sector businesses, so there is that avenue for some folks, if they need extra help. I think our team has done a great job. Just like in the past, if there are businesses that are having challenges, please let us know, and we will make sure we reach out to give them the proper supports.

Question re: Big Creek bridge construction

Ms. McLeod: I have some questions about bridge infrastructure in my riding for the Minister of Highways and Public Works.

The Big Creek bridge is well past the time it should have been completed by. Travellers on the highway continue to utilize the old original bridge. So, can the minister provide an update for Yukoners as to why the new Big Creek bridge is not complete and whether or not the significant delay has cost the project to go overbudget?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The Big Creek bridge, as the member opposite indicated, is nearing the end of its useful life and needs to be replaced. The bridge is located approximately 65 kilometres west of Watson Lake on the Alaska Highway and is an important part of the Yukon's transportation network. The replacement bridge is currently under construction beside the existing bridge. I can also advise that when I travelled to Watson Lake in the late spring, I did see the new bridge under construction.

During our inspections of the new bridge, there were, in fact, some defects found on the new structure. We are working with the contractor to do an assessment of the new bridge and resolve any issues in a timely manner.

Ms. McLeod: This project was slated to be completed over a year ago, but once again, we see delays in getting this infrastructure completed. We have heard that the delay or the problem, that the minister perhaps referenced today, was that the concrete did not pass inspection and is therefore unusable. So, can the minister inform Yukoners if, in fact, this is true and tell this House if the new structure needs to come down before it's even used, and finally, who will be paying for this?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for the question from the member opposite. As the member opposite did indicate, the Yukon government released a tender for the replacement of the Big Creek bridge in 2020. The contract was awarded and work began shortly thereafter. It is true that, during the inspection of the newly constructed bridge, some deficiencies were identified that warranted more investigation.

To better understand how these deficiencies might impact the structure, we are working with the contractor to do a full assessment of the bridge. The assessment will provide details of what additional work the contractor may have to perform to allow the bridge to be used by traffic. The rectification of the deficiencies is the responsibility of the contractor, and at this time, the contract has been extended for one year, with no additional funds currently added to the contract to complete the work.

Question re: École Whitehorse Elementary School replacement

Mr. Kent: Yesterday, in response to questions raised by the Member for Whitehorse Centre about the future of École Whitehorse Elementary, the Minister of Education said the following — and I will quote: "I have read all of the letters and concerns that have been raised with me. I have made a commitment to ensure that all of this information is fed into a fall engagement..."

As we are now into November, can the minister let us know when the fall engagement that she referenced yesterday will take place?

Hon. Ms. McLean: I am happy to rise today to talk about the long-term capital planning for Whitehorse school replacements and other capital types of projects.

In addition to the Whistle Bend, Burwash Landing, and École Whitehorse Elementary school replacement projects, we are excited to develop a long-term capital plan for addressing aging infrastructure in Whitehorse schools. We absolutely need to meet the demands and requirements of modernized learning environments for our growing population in Whitehorse. Engagement with the broader Whitehorse community and partners is planned, yes, for this fall to determine a long-term plan for replacing and renovating aging Whitehorse schools. We want to hear from the public — as I said yesterday — and the school communities to better understand their user experiences with the school facilities and how to better reflect Yukon's K to 12 programming needs. We will be working

closely with the Chiefs Committee on Education, as well, and the First Nation School Board to begin conversations about all the infrastructure and those related to the schools that are in their operation.

Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kent: What I was hoping to hear from the minister is when exactly that fall engagement is scheduled for. As I mentioned, we are into November now, and fall is quickly running out.

As my colleague from Whitehorse Centre also mentioned yesterday, there is a lot of interest in what is going to happen with the current École Whitehorse Elementary School, so can the minister tell us what the government's plans are for the building? Will it be torn down, and if so, what is the plan for that lot?

Hon. Ms. McLean: I am happy to rise again today to talk about the replacement of École Whitehorse Elementary School. The school was originally built in the 1950s and is a top priority for replacement, among other Whitehorse schools. The current facility is not able to keep pace with current or future programming and community needs, including access to spaces for innovative, inclusive, and experiential learning. The Takhini land reserve has been identified as a central location that can accommodate this important new Whitehorse school.

As I stated yesterday, as well, a project advisory committee has been established, and they have started meeting. Again, we'll be working with all of our partners around the planning of this incredibly important new facility. There have been no plans put in place as of yet for the existing building.

Mr. Kent: So, I just wanted to repeat the questions that I asked today that I didn't get a response to.

When exactly is that fall engagement scheduled for? Can the minister also tell us what the government's plans are for the current Whitehorse Elementary School building? Will it be torn down, and if so, what is the plan for that lot?

Hon. Ms. McLean: We are in the process of working through the details of what that engagement will look like, but I can assure Yukoners that we'll be working with all of our partners. There are many educational partners. There are several school communities that I have committed to working with on this engagement and new partners that I'm really happy to be able to talk about today around the Yukon First Nation School Board and the Chiefs Committee on Education. This will be broad consultation.

I have committed to continuing conversations and feeding the information that I've heard from the downtown residents. I'm looking forward to also replying to the petition that was tabled here and accepted today by yourself. I'm looking forward to the consultation. I think these are exciting times, again, Mr. Speaker. This is about good government investing in school infrastructure, and that's something we're very proud of — that we are building schools in the Yukon to meet the modern learning needs of our students.

Question re: Psychology profession regulation

Ms. Clarke: In March, I asked the minister about why it has taken so long to develop a regulatory framework for

psychology in the Yukon. At that time, the minister said that psychology was one of many medical professions that are being considered in a broader health professions modernization project. While I appreciate that this is an important project, there are many in the psychology field who would like to see something in the meantime.

Can the minister tell us if the government has considered any measures to act as a stop-gap? If so, what are they?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: The Yukon has declared a substance use health emergency, highlighting the importance for Yukoners to receive access to quality mental health services. Since we now know that improving the way in which health professions are currently regulated under the *Health Professions Act* — this is a multi-year project, and we are moving ahead with regulating psychologists in the interim. We look forward to working with the psychologists in the territory as work progresses to regulate the profession in the Yukon.

I understand how important this is. I actually met with the psychologists last Friday. We had a very productive meeting. I heard their concerns, and I have certainly heard them before. I am working as closely with them as I can to bring a resolution to this issue in the territory.

Ms. Clarke: In the spring, I suggested that the minister should consider the approach taken in the other two territories, which was an MOU with a provincial regulator. At that time, the minister told the Legislature that this was not possible.

Can the minister explain why the regulatory framework used in the NWT and Nunavut is not possible here in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Well, the regulation of health professionals helps Yukoners receive services from competent professionals who practise according to the high standards and ethics of their profession. It provides Yukoners with clear means and processes for dealing with complaints and disciplinary issues, should they require additional supports to resolve issues with a health care provider. We are working on a comprehensive review of the *Health Professions Act*, which will support enhanced standards of safety of health care for Yukoners by improving consistency in licensing, services to professionals, complaint processes, and overall efficiencies for the regulatory system.

As I said in my previous answer, I had a great meeting with the psychologists. The member opposite has brought forward a suggestion that has come before. We looked at it from a legal point of view: It was that the solution that was found in the NWT and Nunavut was not possible under the legislation we have in the territory.

It also, as I am told, contravened the *Canadian Free Trade Agreement*, so are looking at other options to make sure that these health professionals have a regulation as some way to provide some security and some confidence in their profession here in the territory.

Ms. Clarke: Last year, when I asked when this new regulatory framework would be put in place, the minister said that it was long overdue. While he did commit to advancing this regulatory framework, he did not give a clear indication of timing. Obviously, we would like to see this advance

immediately. Can the minister tell us when Yukoners can expect a regulatory framework for psychology?

Hon. Mr. Mostyn: As I said, I had a great meeting with the psychologists just last week. I heard their concerns. I have heard their concerns in the past, just as has the member opposite. We are working as quickly as we can to come up with a solution that will provide certainty for Yukoners who are seeking psychological help in the territory that those psychologists are professionals and are regulated. We are working that through right now with the department. I have had a meeting with them just on Friday afternoon, after meeting with the psychologists. I am going to continue to work on this file to make sure that Yukoners can have confidence in the medical professionals they seek in the territory and that the medical professionals can hold their heads high that they are working in a territory that actually takes their services seriously.

Speaker: The time for the Question Period has now elapsed.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 448

Clerk: Motion No. 448, standing in the name of the Hon. Ms. McPhee.

Speaker: It has been moved by the Minister of Health and Social Services:

THAT it is the opinion of this House that reproductive healthcare is essential to the health, freedom, and the social and economic futures of women and girls and that the right to an abortion in Yukon and access to abortion services in the territory need to be protected.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I am very pleased to bring this motion for debate today. Abortion rights are human rights. Period.

Access to abortion is a necessary part of health care. There is nothing “pro-life” about those who oppose it. Everyone has the right to safety and bodily autonomy. Mr. Speaker, the only people who should be making decisions about pregnant bodies are the people who are pregnant. I am truly proud to be part of this Yukon Liberal government, which has always recognized reproductive care as essential for those who need it. Our members and staff were also proud to attend the *Roe v. Wade*: Feel Your Feels rally at Rotary Park on June 30 of this year that was presented at that time by the Victoria Faulkner Women’s Centre.

I think that this is an extremely topical issue and that is why I have asked that we bring it forward today. As we continue to see and feel the horrific and heartbreaking impacts of what is happening in the United States after the *Roe v. Wade* decision was overturned earlier this year, we know that we must keep up this conversation; we must keep it going. We must keep the conversation about abortion going. It is all of our responsibility.

We cannot get complacent about this issue. Sometimes this issue — discussing it — might be uncomfortable, but we must keep saying the word “abortion”. It is a right that must be protected.

I am going to speak a little bit about the fallout of this *Roe v. Wade* decision being overturned in the United States. I think that Canadians are feeling this in a way because the United States is such a close partner and ally of ours and we are close to them geographically and otherwise. We are culturally close to them. We see them sometimes as an older sibling, a bigger version of often the Canadian way of life, but I can say that this issue is clearly a wedge issue, and the change that we are seeing in the United States is seeping into conversations here in Canada. It is seeping into actions that are being taken by community members, and it is clearly a topical issue.

With a change in politics to a country that is so close to us, in numerous ways, we are seeing truly devastating change in access to abortion in the United States, and we must not think that we are that far removed from that situation. The decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade* was a politically charged decision, and it has impacted millions and millions of women and pregnant people.

I don’t know if any of us remember a situation or a single stroke of a pen — if I can describe it that way in the decision that came from the United States Supreme Court — that has affected so many people in an adverse way and so many people immediately. The world, Mr. Speaker, needs to stand up against the erosion of this human right. You have the human right to parent or not to parent. What happens when we force pregnant people to give birth, when we force parenthood on people? That’s traumatic, for one. It continues subjugation. It adversely affects mental health. It produces mental health challenges and intense pressures, not to mention issues of poverty, housing, and individual choice. There are few issues that have cut such a wide swath. It continues the barriers to ending poverty, and the list, Mr. Speaker, goes on and on. Let’s be clear: Women will die without access to this basic health care.

I’m going to turn for a moment to the history of abortion here in Canada — just some topical comments, not the full detail of the history. The National Abortion Federation of Canada reminds us all that, while abortion is legal here in Canada, Canada currently has no law regarding abortion. The law that existed in the *Criminal Code* in 1988 was struck from the *Criminal Code* following a 1988 Supreme Court of Canada decision that abortion law or that prohibition — that crime in the *Criminal Code* — was unconstitutional. The law was found to violate section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* because it infringed upon a woman’s right to “... life, liberty and security of the person”.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Brian Dickson wrote in what may have been one of his absolutely all-encompassing quotations — although he wrote many. He wrote, as part of the decision in the Supreme Court of Canada striking down that provision of the *Criminal Code* — and I quote: “Forcing a woman, by threat of criminal sanction to carry a foetus to term unless she meets certain criteria unrelated to her own priorities

and aspirations, is a profound interference with a woman's body and thus a violation of her security of the person."

At that time, Canada became one of the small number of countries without a law restricting abortion. Abortion was now treated like any other medical procedure and was governed by provincial and territorial medical regulations. I will speak just a little bit about that later.

On a personal note, I was in law school in 1988 when this decision came down. There was much discussion about this issue at the time. There was much discussion about the Morgentaler case, which brought this matter before the Supreme Court of Canada, and Dr. Morgentaler's almost single-handed challenge, having spent many periods of time — some brief and some not so brief — in jail for having performed abortions and provided this medical procedure to women in Canada. He almost single-handedly brought an end to this unconstitutional law in the *Criminal Code of Canada*. In fact, his actions and this case left Canada as one of the small number of countries where abortion was treated like any other medical procedure.

In Canada, there are two options for abortions; there is surgical or medical. The cost of a surgical abortion is already fully covered by most provinces and territories. Accessibility is a separate issue. Accessibility to abortion is a responsibility of the provinces and the territories, and so access could be inconsistent for Canadians, depending on where they live.

We are very proud here in the Yukon to have the self-referral Opal Clinic here in Whitehorse. I will speak a little bit about that in a moment.

In 2018, the Yukon Liberal government expanded access to abortion services here in the territory by introducing universal coverage of the medication that is used for medical abortions. This has been helpful for our northern territory when it comes to equal access, and it reduced barriers for many. Offering such medication at no cost is one way that we, here in the Yukon, ensure that Yukoners are able to access the best possible care for their sexual and reproductive health.

Our territory needs to be on the record supporting the right of individuals to choose. Our territory needs to be verbal for the sake of everyone with ovaries and a uterus. They need our voice and our support, which is why we have brought this motion today. As I noted earlier, we cannot be complacent. It's incredibly important that Yukoners know that this right of theirs is protected by virtue of our actions here as a government, as leaders in this territory, and that we will continue to support and protect those rights.

Our territory needs to be clear that we do not take the overturning of *Roe v. Wade* lightly and that it has directly led to women dying. More pregnant people will continue to die because of this political decision in the United States. I feel very strongly that this is not a place for politics. This is about medical procedure, about medical decisions, and about an individual's right to care for their own health.

We have probably all read the articles and listened to stories shared that shatter your heart — stories about those suffering a miscarriage who were not cared for due to fear now or stories of young teenagers who are being forced to give birth

under the regimes that have changed their laws. Everyone has the right to have a healthy pregnancy, birth, and post-partum period. It is almost inconceivable to think that this is not happening wherever it is needed, especially in such an advanced country as the United States. Eighteen states have now banned some or all access to abortion. The United States has the highest maternal mortality rate among developed countries, according to the Commonwealth Fund, and headlines about the maternal mortality crisis continue to be all too common occurrences in a modern society — in a modern world — with medical advances that are almost too many to count.

Some may say, "Why is this an issue here in the Legislative Assembly in the Yukon?" It should be an issue everywhere that is concerned about health care, and I'm looking for support for this motion today, which I hope will be unanimous across this Legislative Assembly, to protect the rights of pregnant people and women who are seeking to make their own decisions about their own health care.

The federal Conservatives here in Canada have said they will not reopen the debate, but this is not leadership. This statement does not protect women in Canada. There could easily be private members' bills brought forward that attempt to end the rights of women in Canada with respect to their health care. This is terrifying, and this has happened. Again, we should not get complacent. There have been continued attempts to pass anti-choice legislation here in Canada between 2006 and 2015, and the conversation about abortion requires strong, accurate leadership advocating for the safety of all.

Here in the Yukon Territory and here in Whitehorse, we have the Opal Clinic that provides confidential care for medication abortions, surgical abortions, and miscarriages up to the 15th week of pregnancy. The clinic also provides IUD insertions by referral. You do not need a referral to get to the Opal Clinic or to attend there, but if you have seen a doctor or a nurse and had an ultrasound or blood test, the clinic would like to be updated about that.

People who live in Whitehorse can book an appointment by calling 867-393-6635. Individuals who live in Watson Lake or Dawson City can make an appointment with one of the doctors there to review their options. They can provide medication abortions, or you can be referred in those communities to the Opal Clinic. If you live in a community with a health centre — and there are many in the Yukon — you can see the nurse to confirm your pregnancy, and they can refer you to the Opal Clinic and help make travel arrangements. You also have the choice to refer yourself to the Opal Clinic by calling the Opal Clinic directly and booking your own appointment. Medical travel supports this kind of travel, should somebody need to come to the Opal Clinic directly.

The Opal Clinic provides two procedures at the Whitehorse General Hospital: an aspiration, or sometimes called a "surgical abortion", from six weeks to the 15 weeks plus three days of pregnancy, and a medication abortion from six to nine weeks of pregnancy. Those are as a result of medical decisions for individuals, and generally the weeks of pregnancy are noted to be appropriate for that medical service and procedure.

The Opal Clinic is an inclusive clinic that will treat you with respect, understanding, and expert care. The clinic's services are available to people of all sexual orientations and gender identities. Non-judgmental counselling is provided to all pregnant people on the day of their consultation.

In addition, the Opal Clinic has some amazing resources online, including a link to the pregnancy options website, with a workbook to help pregnant people examine their concerns and their options. They even have resources linked for those with spiritual concerns, pointing to helpful discussions that are taking place at the Catholics for Choice or the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice organizations here in Canada. The Opal Clinic website also has a pregnancy calculator to help people estimate the number of weeks that they may be pregnant, based on their last period.

We also have the benefit, here in the Yukon, of the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic. The Yukon Sexual Health Clinic is a private clinic that offers sexual and reproductive health services in the Yukon to people of all genders and sexual orientations. Again, you do not need a referral from another health care provider. You can contact the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic, which is located in the Whitehorse Medical Clinic at 406 Lambert Street. I happen to know that if you call the main number for the Whitehorse Medical Clinic, it will give you an option to contact, through their switchboard, the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic.

Women need to make their own decisions. In order to do this, there must be accessible and affordable medical care and those rights must be protected here in Canada.

I just want to review briefly the services that are available. I have described the Opal Clinic, but overall, I think that it is important to understand the services that are available and covered by our Yukon health care insurance plan here in the territory. In the Yukon, pregnancy termination options are available up to 15 weeks plus three days of pregnancy. For pregnancy over that threshold and up to 24 weeks, services are available through the British Columbia Women's Hospital. Currently, there are two types of pregnancy termination services available in the Yukon, as I've noted: therapeutic or surgical, and sometimes aspiration abortions; and medical or medication abortions. Both options are covered for Yukoners under the Yukon health care insurance plan.

Medication abortions are a combination of two medications that are used to provide a non-surgical option for early abortion from six to nine weeks of pregnancy. These services are available in Dawson City and Watson Lake and in Whitehorse, as I've noted, through the Opal Clinic.

Surgical abortion — also known as “aspiration” or sometimes colloquially called a “D and C” — procedures are performed in Whitehorse from six weeks to 15 weeks plus three days of pregnancy. This is a surgical procedure performed only through the Opal Clinic at the Whitehorse General Hospital.

If a pregnancy is over 15 weeks plus three days and up to 24 weeks, patients are able to travel to Vancouver to the BC Women's Hospital and have a procedure there. And that procedure is covered by Yukon health care insurance plan or by perhaps the non-insured health benefits with a referral.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Yukon is committed to supporting Yukoners in creating their own reproductive care plans and expanding access to reproductive and gender-affirming care — something that we have talked about here in this Legislative Assembly. We are committed to making sure that Yukoners have access to the health care services they need, and that includes, on occasion, an abortion. We are working to support Yukoners to access reproductive care services by removing barriers to accessing things like fertility treatments, birth control, and period products.

I won't go into too many of those details, but we are very proud to have released the LGBTQ2S+ *Inclusion Action Plan* back in July 2021 and are implementing the recommendations of the *Putting People First* report — again, all with the concept and goal of providing better health care services for Yukoners.

We continue to work with stakeholders and partners, including the federal government, our health care providers, the Yukon Medical Association, the Yukon Registered Nurses Association, and Yukon First Nations to implement all of these initiatives to expand and improve Yukoners' health care. This fiscal year, we are providing \$1.54 million to support sexual and reproductive health care at the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic and the Yukon Women's MidLife Health Clinic. The Yukon Sexual Health Clinic and the Yukon Women's MidLife Health Clinic are supported by two nurse practitioners.

The Yukon government and the Council of Yukon First Nations signed a \$100,000 contract transfer payment agreement in March 2022 to deliver period products to Yukon schools and other venues. These are just some of the other projects related to this care and the spectrum of care that we are working to provide for Yukoners.

This is not a difficult motion. It seeks that it is the opinion of the House that reproductive health care is essential to the health, the freedom, and the social and economic futures of women and girls. As part of that reproductive health care, it states that the right to an abortion in the Yukon and access to abortion services in the territory need to be protected. I seek and expect unanimous support for such an important piece of women's and pregnant people's health care here in the territory.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this motion.

Mr. Dixon: I am pleased to rise and speak to this motion. This motion is fairly straightforward regarding reproductive health care and we will support it. I support a woman's right to choose what happens to her body and to choose what type of reproductive health care is right for her. My view is that these matters are something that should be left to a woman and the medical professionals who support her. I agree with the motion that reproductive health care is essential to the social and economic futures of women and girls.

I should also note that I am not aware of any current pressing threat to the right to abortion or access to abortion in the Yukon. As far as I can tell, the majority of Yukoners are not interested in reopening this issue. I and the Yukon Party caucus will be voting in favour of this motion.

Ms. Tredger: I know that my colleague, the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin, has more that she wants to say on the topic, but I want to start by just adding some of my own thoughts.

It's an interesting time to be discussing this, because on the one hand, as the Leader of the Official Opposition mentioned, I don't know of any immediate threats to this issue in the Yukon, but that is certainly not the case worldwide. We are seeing a really extraordinary rollback of rights across the States, and that's terrifying for people — as it should be.

It's a really frightening time, to be honest, across the world. So, I'm actually really happy that we're going to be making this really clear statement — as a House, I hope — that this is important to the Yukon and, even as things change in a global context, it's important here, and it's important now.

I had a lot of people reach out to me — I guess it was in the summer, when things started to really heat up in Texas and in other places. I had a lot of people reach out to me. I think it really made people realize how precarious progress can be. I feel lucky that I have never been in a situation where I doubted that I had abortion access if I needed it, but that's not true for so many people across the world. I think I, like many other people, just realized how precarious that can be — how quickly things can change — and how important it is.

Something that I think people often don't realize when we're talking about abortion and debating the different term lengths — by the time conception happens, you're considered to be two weeks into your pregnancy. That really cuts off the time people have to make decisions, when there starts to be restrictions on when they can and can't make decisions. And as many people have said, I think this comes down to: This is a personal decision, this is a medical decision, and it should be left to the people who need to make it, and that's not us; that's the choice of an individual.

I think the other key piece we want to talk about in the Yukon is that it's not just about legal rights but practical rights. You know, the legal right to abortion doesn't mean a lot if you can't actually access one, and I think that's important when we start talking about access to medical care in the communities across the Yukon, as well as just in Whitehorse. So, I hope that's something that we're all keeping in mind as we think about: What does having this right look like in Canada, and what does having this right look like in the Yukon? It's meaningless without easy access, and I hope we're all considering that, as we make decisions that affect this territory.

I will wrap up my comments there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Blake: I will start by stating that my colleagues and I firmly believe in the right to access free and safe abortion services. The Yukon NDP has always, and will continue to be, a champion for abortion and reproductive health rights.

When we speak about the right to abortion, we must also think about access. The right to abortion is only upheld when everyone is able to easily access abortion, no matter who they are or where they live or how much money they have. Unfortunately, Yukoners do not currently have equal access to abortion. Currently, there is only one abortion clinic in the

Yukon. The Opal Clinic, which is located at the Whitehorse General Hospital, provides both medication and aspiration abortions to anyone who is pregnant, up to 15 weeks. For folks who do live in Whitehorse, information about the Opal Clinic is not widely shared. While folks at the clinic work hard to provide this critical service to pregnant Yukoners, this government must do more to ensure that every Yukoner, with or without a family doctor, knows that they can access the Opal Clinic for an abortion.

For folks in communities, it is much more difficult to access abortions. If you live in Watson Lake or Dawson City, you can only access a medication abortion. If you live anywhere else, you have to go to your health centre, where a nurse is only able to provide a referral to the clinic in Whitehorse. This means that, if you want an abortion and you live in Old Crow, or Mayo, or Pelly Crossing, or Carmacks, or Faro, or Ross River, or Beaver Creek, or Burwash, or Destruction Bay, or Haines Junction, or Teslin, or Carcross, or anywhere else in the Yukon, you cannot get an abortion nearby. Instead, you have to find a ride, take time off work, lose wages, and spend money on accommodations to travel to Whitehorse for an abortion. We know that the current medical travel subsidy still does not come close to covering the real costs of medical travel.

Another critical part of reproductive rights is the right to contraception. Unfortunately, contraception is still expensive and difficult to access. Although this government is committed to subsidizing contraception, Yukoners are still having to pay hundreds and even thousands of dollars out of their own pockets for contraception.

After six years in power, this government has not made the move to make contraception free or even affordable for Yukoners. While we do have access to free, safe abortions by medical professionals in the Yukon, there are huge inequities that must be resolved. People who live in communities, people in poverty, and other marginalized people deserve quality reproductive health services just as much as any other Yukoner.

When it comes to the rolling back of rights in the United States, I think about women in the United States who are directly impacted, like the Gwich'in Nation, the Tlingit people, and White River First Nation citizens who access health services in Alaska.

It's important to remind ourselves as leaders in this House how many people connected to the Yukon are impacted by this decision today. I am hopeful that the Yukon will always be a safe and dignified place for people to access abortion and reproductive health services. We have a long way to go before stating that it has upheld the reproductive rights of Yukoners. Mahsi'.

Hon. Ms. McLean: I would like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Health and Social Services, for bringing this important motion forward, Motion No. 448. As a woman, as a mother, as an auntie, as the Minister responsible for the Women and Gender Equity Directorate, I firmly support this motion. Access to reproductive health care, including abortion, is intrinsic to equality, equity, and well-being. I know that, here

in Canada, there were 74,155 abortions performed in clinics and hospitals throughout the country in 2020, according to the Canadian Institute for Health Information. The decision to have an abortion is an emotional, physical, and, in some cases, a spiritual one. The loss of abortion rights in the US has brought forward renewed debate here in Canada. I believe that access to reproductive health care is essential to the health freedom and social and economic future for women, girls, and those able to reproduce.

In Canada, abortion has been legal since 1988. There is no law regarding abortion in this country because it is treated like any other medical procedure. Abortion in Canada is legal and publicly funded in all stages of pregnancy. Canada has taken a comprehensive approach to addressing sexual and reproductive health rights. In 2019, Canada made a 10-year commitment to reach an average of \$1.4 billion in funding each year by 2023 to support women's, children's, and adolescents' health around the world; \$700 million of this funding is dedicated to sexual and reproductive health and rights. Canada is scaling up investments in underfunded areas of reproductive health care and rights, including expanding access to safe abortions and post-abortion care, advancements for adolescents including comprehensive sexuality education, supporting family planning, and advocating for the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence.

However, access to abortion varies by jurisdiction, and we are not immune to challenges to this critical service. Here in Yukon, over this fiscal year, we are spending \$1.5 million to support sexual and reproductive health at the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic and the Yukon Women's MidLife Health Clinic. This funding is in addition to work of the Women and Gender Equity Directorate where this year's budget is over \$3.5 million, focusing on program delivery, public education, and policy research and development.

I am so thankful that Yukoners can access the quality care at the Opal Clinic in Whitehorse. This clinic offers a wide range of reproductive care services, including in-clinic and medication abortions, which can be provided by both self-referral or in collaboration with another health care provider. The clinic offers miscarriage management and has on-site nurse practitioners who can provide a range of supports, including counselling. There is also a First Nation support worker available if the client chooses. The operative word here is "choose". Choice should be the fundamental backbone of any reproductive health care. Having a choice saves lives. Having a choice and access eliminates the need for dangerous complications from unsafe abortions and can absolutely save lives, both literally and figuratively.

We know that, in developing countries and indeed here in Canada, abortion can save the life of a birthing person in medical distress. Having a choice could mean not suffering a life of trauma, stress, and ill mental health for someone who simply did not want, or was not ready, to have a child. Having a choice may mean the ability to end the cycle of poverty or addiction. Having a choice means having options, and options allow people to be their best selves and to pursue the life they want. A government has no right to make these choices. The

rapid decline of these rights south of the border is a reminder of the importance of continuing to stand up for these basic health care rights.

Here at home, the Yukon government is committed to ensuring access to reproductive care. Of course, reproductive care is not just about abortion. We also want to make sure that everyone can access fertility treatment, birth control, period products, and a wide range of other supports. I am proud of the work that we are doing to support the critical issue of access to abortion in the Yukon. Simply put, we cannot achieve gender equity if we do not have the right to choose.

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

Does any other member wish to be heard?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will take just a moment to address some of the facts presented by the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin that were not accurate information about birth control for individuals who have difficulty paying for that. There are some programs — benefits — to assist. Birth control is covered for social assistance recipients by income support services here in the territory.

Coverage for birth control is also currently available to someone who might be under the age of 18 and is enrolled in the children's drug and optical program, which is easy to do, and that program is available to lower income families with children 18 years of age and younger. There is also some funding provided directly to the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic to support lower income clients to receive birth control. So, if the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin knows of anyone who is in the stress of being unable to provide themselves or have the money to provide those services for individuals, I urge them to contact the Yukon Sexual Health Clinic or other programs that are available.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, from the comments from the opposition parties that they will support this motion. I am extremely pleased to hear that because it will allow us to speak as a Legislative Assembly with one voice to support the rights of women and girls here in the territory and to speak loudly about the fact that these rights should be protected for women and girls everywhere.

I look forward to the vote.

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. Silver: Agree.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: Agree.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Agree.
Hon. Ms. McLean: Agree.
Hon. Mr. Mostyn: Agree.
Mr. Dixon: Agree.
Mr. Kent: Agree.
Ms. Clarke: Agree.
Mr. Cathers: Agree.
Ms. McLeod: Agree.
Mr. Hassard: Agree.
Mr. Istchenko: Agree.
Ms. White: Agree.
Ms. Blake: Agree.
Ms. Tredger: Agree.

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

Speaker: The yeas have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Motion No. 448 agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 20, entitled *Animal Protection and Control Act*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

Bill No. 20: *Animal Protection and Control Act* — continued

Chair: The matter now before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 20, entitled *Animal Protection and Control Act*.

Is there any further general debate?

Mr. Cathers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be very brief in my comments before turning it over to the minister. I will just recap from the tail-end of yesterday. As the minister will recall, we were discussing section 41 of this legislation, and I was expressing some concern with the specific requirements under that section all being a “must”. I was having difficulty finding a section of the legislation that provided any

exception to the specific requirement to keep your animal confined to your property or vehicle and, secondly, the prohibition regarding an animal being on public property.

The minister at the time indicated that he was looking into it and acknowledged that there might be a typo or the need to add some language in there. I am just paraphrasing from what he said, which can be found on page 2512 of yesterday’s Blues, and I would just turn it over to the minister now and welcome anything he may have to say about this section of the act.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Thank you for the opportunity to speak to Bill No. 20, entitled *Animal Protection and Control Act*, in the Chamber today. I would just like to introduce chief veterinary officer Mary Vanderkop, to my left, and Rebecca Veinott, to my right, who is a legislative drafter.

I will be brief in my responses, but I would acknowledge the points that the Member for Lake Laberge made yesterday with respect to section 41 of the *Animal Protection and Control Act*.

I can advise that I have directed the policy persons and, if necessary, the legislative drafters to review the section and am open to receiving advice to that about possible concerns that may arise coming from the comments made by the Member for Lake Laberge. I have advised the member opposite that we can proceed — what I propose we do is proceed with general debate in Committee of the Whole for Bill No. 20 this afternoon. If we do complete consideration of — if we complete general debate in Committee of the Whole, I will propose to rise and move progress, and then we could come back with line-by-line review on a later date, having had the opportunity to do the necessary homework in review of that section and be in a position to report back to the House.

So, that’s what I would propose. Of course, I’m in the hands of the House as to whether the members wish to do that at that time. I suppose what I’m doing is telegraphing that this is what I would propose to do at that point.

I believe I have a few minutes of specific response to some of the points the Member for Lake Laberge made at the end of the day yesterday with respect to — I have some answers on cat control, dog control, and horse control. So, I’ll provide those, and then we can continue with the afternoon.

We want to take this opportunity to emphasize that owners not only have the responsibility to care for but to control their domestic animals. This was a key concept and request we heard during our extensive consultation on the development of this legislation. To more directly answer the questions posed by the Member for Lake Laberge regarding cats and what the bill means when it refers to “under control”, cats, like all other domestic animals under the act, will need to be under the owner’s control. The significant issue, in particular with roaming cats, is to prevent the potential for cats to become feral. When cats are at large and have not been spayed or neutered, they reproduce at a rapid rate. When these populations are established, disease may be rampant, and they have a significant impact on prey species, like songbirds and rodents.

In one instance alone where feral cats were established in a Yukon community, the residents noticed a significant decline in the number of songbirds. Additionally, conservation officers

were called upon to respond to wolves near the community, which were attracted to the community by the population of feral cats. I would also like to emphasize that there is a welfare concern that a high percentage of feral kittens die from disease or starvation. We have a duty of care to domestic animals. This bill supports the values Yukoners expressed, and our level of care needs to meet their expectations, not only for the care of domestic animals, but their control.

With respect to dog control, we heard from the public that they wanted control to be defined so that it is not overly prescriptive — for instance, like requiring an owner to have their dog on a leash. As I indicated in my preliminary comments, further analysis of section 41 is to come. Fully recognizing that exercise and socialization are extremely important to the well-being of dogs, we want to have certainty that dogs can be off leash as long as they are under control. This includes being able to take your dog for a walk — leashed — on public property, like the research forest. It allows for the free running exercise of sled dogs that is critical for their welfare. Focusing the obligation of the owner to have their animal under control provides for this allowance.

In addition, there is an ongoing demand that officials have the authority to take custody of domestic animals that are at large, for example, packs of dogs roaming in communities, or livestock that needs to be reunited with their owners. It is important that we have this authority and are able to take custody of animals at large for the safety of the public and the safety of the animals.

Finally, briefly, with respect to horse control, the member opposite also raised a concern with respect to grazing horses owned by outfitters or wilderness tourism operators, which may be free-ranging. Control in these situations does not mean that the horses need to be confined by a fence, but as the member opposite identified, owners will often provide feed or hobble individual animals to keep the herd in proximity to their camp. This is exactly why the act is not prescriptive; requiring a horse to be confined by a fence of a prescribed height would not reflect Yukon realities.

The act allows for control by other animals that respect the practices of working animals. We understand the importance of working animals to these businesses. We appreciate the value that outfitting and wilderness tourism businesses contribute to the Yukon's economy. As I have said a number of times, we will continue to engage with them as the regulations are being developed.

Mr. Cathers: I do thank the minister for the commitment to look at section 41 and the acknowledgement that amendments may be appropriate to that area. I do appreciate him acknowledging that some of the concerns I had brought forward are indeed relevant related to this section. In speaking to the value of consultation with people who are affected by it, I note that the specific issue with that section is actually something that a constituent, who looked at the legislation, brought to my attention. It wasn't until it was raised with me that I looked at it again and went, "Oh, that actually is a valid point." I assumed that it was not the intention of the

government to prohibit animals being off property or on public property running loose, et cetera.

I just want to give that brief aside there. When talking about both the legislation and regulations, I think that there is a real value in consulting with people who are directly affected by it, because the reality is that, even if government has the best intentions, they simply don't know how it may apply to every individual person or business in the same way that those people do.

Some of the feedback that I have heard from the stakeholders — since this legislation was tabled, I have heard of specific activities related to their business that I was not aware of, so I would not have been in a position where I could have even passed those concerns on to the minister or others in government, because they know their businesses better than I do, better than the minister does, better than officials do, no matter how well-intentioned someone may be in drafting language that they think reflects the situation.

I want to move on to a couple of other areas here where I had questions related to the act. I'm just going to ask the minister again — on the topic of exercise and socialization that's reflected — I'm just going to find the correct section. There's a requirement under section 30 in part 4 of the act that requires an opportunity for exercise and socialization. It's under another section, where it says that the owner of an animal "must" — and it states that they have to provide that opportunity.

The question in that area is, as I mentioned before, that putting it in place as a legal requirement is something that has a legal effect. In the case of individual situations, such as I gave the example of earlier in debate, what does that mean if someone has just one dog or one horse, especially if they are in a remote area or themselves have mobility issues, for example, and may not be able to provide that animal with the opportunity to socialize with other animals, even if they wished to do so? That's a question and a concern, if this is put in place as a legal requirement.

If it's not clearly defined, then there is the risk, in my view, that someone could run afoul of this legislation due to a situation that is somewhat beyond their control. I would certainly hope it's not the intention of the government — I doubt, in fact, that it's the intention of the government — to make it a situation where someone has to have more than one dog, if they have a dog at all, or has to have more than one horse, if they have a horse or — the same for cats or any other species.

So, I just ask the minister to explain a bit what the intention of this is and explain, in answer to the concern about the risk of putting this in legislation, where are the exceptions to this that would prevent someone who owns one pet from running afoul of the law.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I just had the opportunity confer with the chief veterinary officer on this. So, in the legislation, there are a few responses, but the requirement is for an opportunity for exercise and socialization and not a requirement for that. Perhaps that's a distinction without a difference, but I mean, it is not so prescriptive. Also, it's not that a horse or a dog has to

socialize with the same species; the legislation contemplates socialization broadly, which is meant to include humans or other animals. So, section 30(b) says: "... provide the following with respect to that animal in a manner that is appropriate to the age, species, and type of animal...", and then (iv) says: "... opportunity for exercise and socialization..." For example, an older dog would not be expected to exercise the same as a younger dog. The act requires owners to manage their animals in such a way that the animal does not injure or kill another animal or wildlife — sorry, that's not really an answer to the question. It is paramount that animals known to be aggressive are under control at all times, but the owner remains responsible to ensure that the animal has appropriate opportunities to meet basic needs and can exercise in a safe manner.

So, not prescriptive — other species are included with respect to socialization. As with most, if not all, elements of this act, engagement and education is paramount, and as I said a few times, that includes humans as contemplated within the concern about socialization.

Mr. Cathers: I do appreciate that clarification, and the minister's comments will hopefully guide future interpretations of this as well. I do appreciate his indication that this clause of section 30 regarding the opportunity for exercise and socialization — he indicates "socialization" is meant to not be limited to the species the animal is a member of, but also be broad enough to include people or other species.

That certainly does reduce the concern that I had in reading this section — since it should, with any pet or other animals, be a situation where someone could themselves spend time with that animal. In my view, it doesn't completely eliminate my concerns about the section or how it may be applied, including the definition of appropriate exercise and who determines that, but the fact that socialization does include, as the minister indicated, socialization with a member of another species and with people definitely minimizes the concern with that particular word in the clause.

Before I forget, the minister made mention, in talking about section 41 about outfitters' horses being in an area, and seemed to be indicating, if I heard him correctly, that it's not the government's intention to prevent an outfitter or other business owner from having horses in an area where they may be on public land and grazing or eating hay or both and may not be either fenced, tied, or hobbled. Could the minister just confirm that I understand him correctly with that?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: It does reflect the policy intent of the legislation, yes.

Mr. Cathers: Just to clarify this, because I have had this specific concern registered with me by people — so, it would be the situation then that the government's intention would be, if a horse is owned by an outfitter or another owner and were in an area on public land not fenced, not tied, and not hobbled, that as long as the animals were not doing something like causing a problem to wildlife or some other form of damage or had simply gone off and were completely beyond the outfitter's ability to get them back under control, the government's interpretation and our intention is that this would be considered a lawful activity.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Yes, and just for the record — just to confirm that section 41(b) of the *Animal Protection and Control Act* requires owners to manage their animals in such a way as to prevent any of the issues further identified in this section. This section is written to acknowledge that working animals, such as horses, can continue to be utilized on public land without being strictly contained by fencing — again, providing that the actions or presence of those animals does not result in any of the negative effects further identified in this section.

I think that accords with the member opposite's interpretation — or his question.

Mr. Cathers: I do appreciate the answer and the clarification from the minister and, of course, as he noted earlier — and I thanked him for it — he has committed, as well, to look further at section 41 and perhaps make changes to it.

I will move on to another part. I just did want to clarify that because it was a specific concern that has been raised with me by constituents.

I want to move back to part 30 since, as I mentioned, I just didn't want to forget to raise that point that I had written down. Under part 30, under "Duties of owners", it talks about the requirements for an owner to provide shelter that includes reasonable measures to exclude predators. I had the concern raised with me about what that means — what the definition of "reasonable" is. For example, for farmers who keep their horses, cattle, or other livestock in a field, if the fencing in that situation — it would be, in a situation like that, common that there might be a barn or other shelter that the livestock or horses could go into, but that there likely wouldn't be fencing that actually prevented predators such as wolves going through or bears from breaking through. So, the question in that, since the act includes a specific requirement for shelter that has reasonable measures to exclude predators — I just would appreciate some clarification from the minister regarding what they would view that meaning for horses or for cattle or for chickens, for example, that may have an outdoor pen that allows them to be beyond their chicken coop, but they may be in a situation where they are not necessarily in an area where a fox would be unable to dig in, a bear would be unable to breach the fence, or a bird such as an eagle might be able to come in, particularly if there were chicks.

I'm just seeking some clarification on whether those situations that I described are something that the government intends to be legal or to prohibit, because it will have a significant impact or could, I should say, have a significant impact on people, depending on how that is applied.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: So, the overarching desire is to provide shelter to the best of their ability — keeps out predators to ensure that an animal is not killed by the predator as well as reduces the cause for anxiety in that animal. Reasonable measures to exclude predators depends on the species and how much they are expected to be an attractant to predators. Historically, horses are capable of fending for themselves on the Yukon landscape.

We are interested, actually, in preventing the attraction of predators to smaller species and encouraging farmers to

undertake to protect these animals, including poultry and rabbits. Education is a cornerstone of any enforcement effort, so that is where the Department of Environment will start — with what is reasonable.

As the member opposite will know, in the section that he has brought to my attention, it is the reasonableness standard. The reasonableness standard probably, I would say, exists already in the Yukon. It doesn't say that owners have to take heroic measures that guarantee that an animal is not killed. There would be case law from across the country as to what a reasonableness standard is both in legislation such as the *Animal Protection and Control Act* but in all manner of other legislation. So, once again, as with a lot of this legislation, education is important. The reasonableness standard is also important for both the Department of Environment and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources through the Agriculture branch in trying to educate farmers — it appears that smaller animals are a bit of a focus — to have a circumstance for the animals that does not unduly provide attractants to potential prey.

The governing principle is the reasonableness standard. Also, there does appear to be some sort of hierarchy of education and hierarchy of animals that both departments will be engaging with owners on to educate and ensure that there aren't negative outcomes.

Mr. Cathers: I do appreciate the information from the minister, because this is a topic, as I mentioned, of question and concern for my constituents and others. There are situations where, I think, typically speaking, it is fair to say that most owners of smaller species, such as what the minister was referring to — chickens, turkeys, rabbits, et cetera — try to make reasonable efforts to keep their animals safe from the risks that they believe may be present, but there are also a number of situations where that doesn't work.

The concern that I am driving at here includes the fact that, if an owner is actually making what they believe are reasonable efforts to protect their animals and it doesn't work, we won't have a situation where they are in breach of the act and face a fine, which effectively, on top of the bear just being a bear — but effectively creating an impact or a punishment, if you wish to refer to it that way, to the owner for them making a mistake regarding their chicken coop. Then, if the government comes along on top of that and makes matters worse when somebody has already suffered some financial hardship, in my view, that would not be a just situation to have people who were genuinely trying to take reasonable measures and then ended up losing their animals to a bear or a wolf and then being fined by the government on top of that.

I will also go to a specific example — without noting who it was — of a constituent. This summer, they were raising turkeys and had taken what they believed were appropriate fencing requirements to protect them from predators — specifically coyotes. They were also attempting to deal with coyotes in the area and avoid them being there to pose a risk to the turkeys, but ultimately, in the long run, the coyote ended up successfully getting some of the turkeys, despite their best

efforts to both keep the coyote out and to shoot the coyote when it was in the area and they believed it to be a problem.

I'm just seeking some clarification that, in situations like that, people who have taken what they honestly believed were reasonable measures to protect their livestock are not going to be facing a situation where the government then adds to the hardship that they have faced through the loss of animals by fining them for a breach of this section of the act.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I agree with almost everything that the member opposite said with respect to situations where it would be, obviously, punitive on the livestock or animal owner to be punished in circumstances.

So, let's just be clear for the record. All owners must make reasonable efforts to provide exclusion from predation; however, the methods for exclusion will be primarily outcome-based. We have chosen not to be prescriptive in this situation and to work with individuals to support them to assess or upgrade shelter as required.

I also note that there are resources available to support owners to upgrade fencing. The enforcement is not intended to punish people who are making a sincere effort to keep their animals safe — and rather, to point people in the right direction to get help.

Mr. Cathers: I thank the minister for that clarification. I will move on to just another couple of questions specific to containment and fencing. There's a section that allows regulations for containment standards. I would just ask — two things — whether the government plans to implement any more double-fencing requirements than what it has in place under the sheep and goat control order. Do they intend to apply that to other animals?

I would just note, specifically around the question of poultry — I just ask for clarification that the government's idea of what are reasonable measures to exclude predation would not require an owner of a poultry farm to either fence or roof over an entire outdoor run or to have electric fencing around an entire outdoor coop area.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The first question, I believe, is about double-fencing requirements for other animals. There is currently engagement with producers who have Eurasian boar, and there is an agreement on a fencing standard to support containment of these high-risk livestock. This was developed in consultation between industry and the Agriculture branch and has been endorsed, so we wish to empower that — to engage on that. There is an intent to adopt the current Yukon fencing guidelines for Eurasian pigs into regulations; however, it is important to note that the fencing standards developed in this guideline were done in cooperation and at the direct request of the Yukon Hog Producers Association and the Yukon Agricultural Association.

With respect to the other question — whether there will be a requirement for a roof over poultry fencing — the answer is no. We recognize the value of free range for poultry production. It would only suggest that poultry be confined at night, when predators are most likely to be out — so, no fence on top of the run.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate the answers from the minister. The one that I believe he missed, though, is just a question about whether the government is contemplating electric fencing being required for chicken coops for an outside area. I'm just hoping to hear confirmation that this is not something envisioned becoming an absolute requirement.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: No, there is no contemplation currently of there being a requirement for electrical fencing.

Mr. Cathers: I thank the minister for that clarification. I would just note — I just wanted to, on behalf of colleagues, note some concerns from communities that they represent about the lack of consultation in those communities in the lead-up to the development of this legislation. Looking at page 2 of the government's "what we heard" document, which was released in July 2019, notably absent from the list includes the community of Ross River, which has been one that the government has often referenced as one of the communities where they argue that the measures in this legislation are most needed. While I certainly recognize, as we all do, that there have been serious issues in Ross River, which in one case proved tragic, related to dogs running loose in that community, it does seem that, if one of the major arguments for putting in place some of those dog control measures relate to that community, that the community didn't have consultation in the development of the "what we heard" document and didn't have the opportunity to be involved in the consultation on the legislation itself. If indeed this is intended to help solve the problem there, it would seem to me that the people in the community of Ross River might be very interested in what this means and might wish to have an opportunity for input on whether what government is purporting to be a solution to the problem, in their view, actually meets the needs of their community. So, notably, Ross River was not on the list, as listed in the government's document.

Also, Watson Lake has not been consulted. I know that my colleague, the Member for Watson Lake, has been in contact with her constituents, and I understand that the Town of Watson Lake is in the process of writing a letter, if they haven't already, to the minister asking for consultation on the legislation, noting that they were not consulted earlier on. While I don't wish to put words in their mouths, my understanding is that another of their specific concerns is about the downloading of responsibility onto the municipality as a result of government passing legislation, that they would then potentially be in a position where they would be expected to enforce and have their staff respond. So, I would just make the minister aware that, if that letter hasn't arrived, it is likely to soon.

I would note as well that, in the case with my colleague in Kluane, while there was a meeting in the Takhini River subdivision, which I believe is in reference to just inside the borders of Kluane — Kluane is one of the largest ridings in the Yukon, and for the communities within most of that area, there was no community consultation that occurred, according to the government's list.

So, for Haines Junction, there was no opportunity to be consulted four years ago or on the development of the

legislation now. The same goes for Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, Burwash Landing; none of them had community meetings, according to the government's "what we heard" document. I would just note that, in my view, that is a mistake. If these provisions are intended to apply in communities, there should be the opportunity for those communities to be involved in discussions about that.

I would just note that the concept of something is one thing, but the details of how government actually proposes to do it can make a big difference. As the Premier, the Member for Klondike, was fond of saying when he was in opposition, the devil is in the details. One thing I do agree with him on is that the details are important. The concept of something that government brings forward or consults on at a high level can change very significantly, in terms of its implementation, once you see legislation.

I would also note that — without wanting at this point to get into too much of a conversation since we've discussed it before — of what the government heard during the earlier consultation, the issue of dogs running loose in a community and whether people believe that should be prohibited altogether or only if the dog is actually causing a nuisance or causing damage, that is probably fair to say that it is likely somewhat subjective, based on individual communities and whether those communities are having problems with that or have in the past. There are other areas, for example, in my riding of Lake Laberge where, in some rural areas, many people have dogs that are loose on their property during the day and generally don't create a nuisance to others in the area.

There are some exceptions to that, of course, but the answer the government might receive to the question of what rules should be in place for dogs — the answer would probably differ if you asked the question in Ibex Valley or the Hot Springs Road area versus if you asked it in Ross River. And the question if you asked people in Whitehorse for feedback on that may be a different answer than you would receive in a community such as Old Crow or Dawson City.

I want to be clear that I am not ascribing specific views to any one of those communities. I'm just noting that there are notable differences in all of those communities. One reason in the past that there has been more of a community approach to dog control areas under the *Dog Act* is recognizing that, in some rural areas, perhaps those additional restrictions were not actually wanted by residents in the area, while in others, they indeed might very much be wanted by people in those areas.

So, that, I would just note from a consultation perspective, is one of the reasons why I think it's important to do more consultation with not only stakeholders, but municipalities and communities that are unincorporated, because the individual needs and interests in those communities may vary enough that the rules, perhaps, should be different in those areas.

After having put that on record — I did want to note those points — I want to ask the minister another specific question in this case related to section 37 of the bill — if you'll bear with me while I find the exact page here. Section 37 of the bill relates to animal fighting. Of course, I want to note that I absolutely agree with the intention of stopping deliberate animal fighting

and making it an offence to deliberately seek to have dogs or other animals fighting. What I would ask for some clarification on is the wording. In section 37(1), it says: “The owner of an animal must not train the animal to fight another animal or permit the animal to fight another animal.” It’s the second part of that I have a question about — what the definition of “permit the animal to fight another animal” means. As the minister may know, if you have dogs, you may end up in a situation where, through no intention of your own, your dog ends up in a fight with another animal — either one that you own or is owned by someone else — and that is a situation where it is through no intent of the owner. But what I am seeking clarification on is, with that wording — “must not ... permit the animal to fight another animal” — I am just asking for clarification that it doesn’t make it an offence if your dog gets into a fight that you were not deliberately seeking to have them in.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The member opposite knows that, over the last four and a half days, I have had a lot to say about engagement and next steps, but in the spirit of continuing to answer specific questions, I will provide perhaps just a few minutes on the record, as the Member for Lake Laberge has put concerns on the record. But I will keep these comments brief. We met with those First Nations and communities that invited us in and had time for us, but the department extended out the invitation to all. The department has not pushed the agenda onto any stakeholders but has made every effort to engage on an ongoing basis. The department has supported dog health clinics in Ross River on several occasions since this report came out, and I have shared information and concerns with them at the time.

We welcome the letter from Watson Lake and we will respond to engage with the Town of Watson Lake and the Liard First Nation, if they wish to engage as well. We do not intend to download requirements. What we are doing is making a standard baseline of animal control and protection legislation available to communities and to First Nations across the Yukon. It will be available for any government to implement and YG will assist with training, supplies, accreditation, and support. The intent of the engagement on regulations is to get those exact details that will support the implementation of the act.

The “what we heard” document is a snapshot of feedback that we received through that formal consultation. The animal health unit is very active in the communities and is aware of the needs of communities such as Ross River and parenthetically also certainly looks forward to the response from Kluane country.

This legislation is designed to allow for different enforcement in each community. There is not a one-size-fits-all approach. We know that there are community dogs in many towns that wander at will, and everyone is happy to have them out and about. They greet and wander and are accepted. The legislation is set up to ensure that enforcement is done differently in each area and that only the dogs that are causing problems — in terms of threatening people or property, including pets — are the ones where enforcement needs to take place. The legislation will allow communities and governments that would like the assistance of the Yukon government to

address animal protection and control issues in their communities to enter into agreements to do so. This is particularly helpful for communities that do not have bylaws or other lawmaking powers to address these matters.

With respect to the specific question about the proposed section 37(1) of the bill where it states that an “owner of an animal must not train the animal to fight another animal or permit the animal to fight another animal”, this situation may occur where dogs fight another animal or another dog. The response rests on the idea that the owner is permitting it — so, granting permission to his or her dog to engage in the fight. That is granting permission. This granting of permission to fight is what we seek to prohibit. It would not be an offence for dog fights to occur in the course of normal activities. We know that they are not avoidable — as the Member for Lake Laberge has put forward — in some cases, and we have no wish to punish anyone when this occurs.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate that information from the minister regarding section 37 and appreciate the clarification that it’s not the intention to make it an offence if dogs get into a fight through no deliberate action on the part of the owner. It is the reality for many responsible pet owners, as well as dog mushers, that there are some dogs that may, when they come into contact with others, be prone to picking a fight. I know many owners who make best efforts to control that, but sometimes things happen. Flashing back into the past, when I was growing up and had a dog team of my own, it was an issue that I knew personally. I had a couple of dogs that were prone to being more aggressive and did everything in my power, short of not exercising the dogs, to try to prevent that being a problem. But sometimes, despite best efforts, there was nothing you could do to prevent a fight occurring between your own animals. So, I am pleased by the indication from the minister that they don’t intend to make it an offence if people are in a situation where dog teams come into contact or when loose dogs come into contact — that, as long the owner is not granting permission, as I believe the minister said, for them to engage in that fight, they would not be committing an offence. Did I hear him correctly on that?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I will just repeat the position of the department so that it’s clear for the record. Hopefully, I’m answering the member opposite’s question.

The situation may occur where dogs fight with another animal or another dog. The response rests on the idea that the owner is permitting it — so granting permission to his or her dog to engage in a fight. That is granting permission. This — and I quote — “granting of permission” to fight is what we seek to prohibit. It would not be an offence for dog fights to occur in the course of normal activities. We know that these are not avoidable in some cases and have no wish to punish anyone when this occurs. I’m not sure if that was the specific follow-up question, but if it requires further clarification, I look forward to clarifying.

Mr. Cathers: I thank the minister for that clarification. That is indeed what I was asking, and I do appreciate that clarification occurring.

I am just trying to find the next part in my notes. There is reference in the “what we heard” document to talking about limiting the number of animals that someone can have. I want to be clear that I recognize that, in some cases where someone has a pattern of not adequately caring for their animals, that may be necessary, but in looking at page 17 of the “what we heard” document — and the minister made some reference to it in his comments, although I don’t have that section from Hansard open, though I am sure it is somewhere in my stack of papers here — there is talk of whether someone should have to get a permit to have multiple animals. According to the “what we heard” document — which for the benefit of Hansard and anyone listening or reviewing the Hansard transcripts here is on page 17 of the “what we heard” document — the heading in the “what we heard” document is: “Should individuals be required to get a permit if they have a lot of animals?” It says: “The survey asked whether a permit should be required for someone to have multiple animals, but responses showed that the question was not clear and a follow-up question about the number of pets that would require a permit was not consistently answered.”

It then goes on to say: “It was clear that people supported a threshold so that someone could not own an unlimited number of dogs or other animals with no oversight.” Then it went on to talk about how: “Over 100 respondents suggested a threshold of over 5 animals. No respondents to the survey proposed a threshold for this higher than 10 animals.” That is an area where it seems to be in reference to pets, not to livestock or to sled dogs, but it is concerning that, flipping to the next page, it does go on to mention mushers.

There is a reference on page 18, under “Next Steps”. One of the specific items cited says: “Create a requirement for someone with more than 10 dogs over the age of four months to obtain a permit...” I would just ask the minister if he could confirm if it is the government’s intention to require everyone with more than 10 dogs to get a permit. To clarify, in that context, would there be an exemption for mushers, or would that apply to anyone who has a dog team or dog kennel of 10 animals or more?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: I have a follow-up question for the member opposite. Was he referring to the “what we heard” document or a specific section of the proposed bill?

Mr. Cathers: Just in clarification for the minister, in the act itself — I believe it was under the regulation-making powers here, but I don’t have the exact page right in front of me. There is some reference to —

Bear with me, and I will find that section.

It is taking me longer than I expected for that, so I will look for that section later, but there was a part in the act that made reference to the ability to set regulations around the number of animals someone could have. Then I was referring back to the “what we heard” document and quoting from it and seeking clarification on whether the statements in the “what we heard” document reflect what the government’s intentions are today, whether they do plan to put in a threshold for the maximum number of animals someone can have. Then I was asking if that is intended to apply to dogs. Are dog mushers — in the

government’s plans, I should say — exempt from that requirement or included in that requirement? And I then asked them to clarify whether that would mean that anyone with a kennel of more than 10 dogs in the territory would then be required to get a permit.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The section of the bill, I believe, is section 40 for the member opposite’s reference. Restrictions on the number of animals that someone can own is a mechanism that is provided for in response to hoarding situations, and it is specifically addressed in section 40, which states that a director can apply to a justice for an order that will limit the number of animals. Section 40(2) provides authority through the courts to manage hoarding situations and not only remove animals at risk, but also to prevent the situation from reoccurring, which typically happens without some intervention. In these situations, it is important that this authority be provided in a timely manner, without waiting for conviction or appeals to get through the court system. Again, this requires reasonable grounds to believe a high standard that must be met and attested to by an official and meet the standard of a judge of the Territorial Court.

There is no intention to limit the number of animals that anyone else may own. While this was discussed, it ultimately came down to: How are sled dogs different from livestock? And there are no limits on the number of livestock species, so it would not be reasonable. So, it was determined that it would not be reasonable to limit the number of dogs.

The potential for limiting the number of animals of a given species — reference in regulations is related to a partnership with local governments where they may seek to expand the legislation beyond what is currently specified that might be applied in their settlement lands. In those cases, governments would consider developing regulations to support a First Nation in those cases.

So, the first response, I believe — is it is a hoarding situation that requires an application to the court and that a certain evidentiary burden must be met? — reasonable grounds to believe — and then a certain order would be made, with no intention of limiting the number of sled dogs and there is no limitation on other livestock.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate that clarification from the minister. It was certainly a concern I had heard from constituents and others about the potential for that, specifically considering what it said in the “what we heard” document. I’m glad to hear the minister clarifying that he’s only intending that section of limiting the number of animals to apply in the case of section 40, seeking a judicial order for that. In that area, I would also note my personal view that, generally speaking, I agree with the concept of allowing an application to be made before a judge — if indeed there is a case where someone has a history of chronically neglecting their animals’ care or abusing them — to create the ability where one of the potential measures that a judge could put in an order would be limiting the number of animals, or the number of a species, that a specific owner would have. I appreciate the minister’s clarification that they’re not planning on going beyond those situations — or I believe he said “communities” — and that’s

good, because the application of it beyond there was potentially concerning.

So, the minister indicated that they're not intending to apply a limit of a certain number of dogs to sled dogs or to livestock. Is that something the government is considering doing regarding any other animal, such as, for example, the minister has mentioned cats in the past. Is it the government's intention to place a limitation on the number of cats that someone can have, or is it a case, again, that such action would only be envisioned if there is a need to seek a judicial order under section 40?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: Yes, that's correct — in response to the Member for Lake Laberge. That would only be in the hoarding — the so-called “hoarding” — in the vernacular known as the “hoarding section” where an order was required and an appearance before a Justice or a Judge of the Territorial Court. So, that would be the same with respect to cats.

Mr. Cathers: I thank the minister for that clarification. I have also just had handed to me by one of my colleagues a letter from the Town of Watson Lake to the minister. That is the one that I made reference to earlier that would be coming if it wasn't already sent. I will table a copy of it, but I will also — just for the minister, for officials, for Hansard, and for other members who I am sure have not had the chance to read the content of it yet — read the content of that letter, and then I will table the letter for the record here. Since I only have one copy in my hand, hot off the press, I will just read from the letter before I table it.

The letter was addressed to the Minister of Environment. It notes his name, so the rules of the Legislative Assembly prevent me from saying it. It says: “Re: Animal Protection Act” — and I quote: “Mayor and Council was recently made aware of a new Animal Protection Act that has been tabled in the Legislative Assembly and hope that you can take some time to answer questions that Council has about this Bill and the Yukon government's consultation process.

“Based on information found on the Yukon government website, public engagement was conducted in 2018 with public meetings held in most Yukon communities, however, not in Watson Lake. Can you please provide some background information on why a public engagement meeting was not held in Watson Lake? Did the Liard First Nation participate in the consultation process? Were any of the survey responses that you received from Watson Lake residents? Was another engagement session held in the spring/summer of 2019 as planned?

“We are also curious to know if our Bylaw department was made aware of the consultation process and invited to provide feedback? As the consultation for this Bill was completed several years ago, is further consultation being planned? Was feedback provided from Watson Lake regarding what tools and mechanisms would best empower Animal Control/Bylaw Officers to design and enforce animal control requirements in our community?

“Lastly, based on the anticipated timeline in the “What We Heard” document, Legislative changes were meant to be

completed by 2020. Can you tell us the reason for the two year delay and what changes were made to the Act?

“We feel these questions are important, as the current Town of Watson Lake Council members and Administration do not recall any consultation in our community around the Animal Protection Act, and no information has been shared about what changes could potentially be required when it comes to animal enforcement and protection, and how it may affect our current Bylaws and practices.

“We thank you for your time and look forward to hearing back from you.

“Sincerely, Christopher Irvin, Mayor, Town of Watson Lake”

The letter is also copied to my colleague, the Member for Watson Lake, as well as the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Leader of the Third Party, and the Association of Yukon Communities. I will then table that letter, Madam Chair, for the official records.

So, having read that in, I would just ask the minister to respond to the concerns and questions of the Town of Watson Lake from their letter that I just read into the record.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: As we have done with all of the letters that we have received — the six or seven letters that we have received — in the last week or so, the departments will respond immediately and answer all those questions.

I could repeat myself, but what I would say is that I will allow the department to answer some of those operational questions that are being asked on the fly.

One question was with respect to how the enforcement — or how this legislation could be adapted in individual communities. And I would just repeat that this legislation is designed to allow for different enforcement in each community. There is not a one-size-fits-all approach. We know that there are community dogs in many towns that wander at will.

With respect to the engagement, we did meet with those First Nations and communities that invited us in and had time for us. I am advised that an invitation was extended to all.

Just to clarify as well, we do not intend to download requirements. What we are doing is making a standard baseline of animal control and protection legislation available to communities and First Nations across the Yukon. It will be available for any government to implement, and YG will assist with training, supplies, accreditation, and support. The intent of engagement regulations is to get those exact details that will support the implementation of the act.

I would also say that I did attend the community of Watson Lake in May of this year, and I met with Mayor Irvin and his council at the time. We had an agenda. I think there were more Highways and Public Works agenda items than perhaps Environment, and I can see that would have been a good opportunity to brief Mayor Irvin and his council at the time, and I would have been in a position to do so. I guess, candidly, I was not aware of whether the mayor and council required information on the progress of the bill in May of 2022, but I met with council for an hour — an hour and a half or so — at that time, and we canvassed a number of matters.

Certainly, I am very confident that the Department of Environment and the Agriculture branch will be reaching out to Watson Lake. I have every indication that we will answer all the questions that have been posed by this letter, but one thing I can verify for the record is that a letter was sent September 11, 2018, to the Mayor of Watson Lake, seeking input on the development of the new legislation. As well, a letter was sent to the Liard First Nation at that same time.

As I have said a number of times over the course of the last five days, my view is that this was a very thorough consultation that involved many First Nations and individuals and communities. Of course, it's not perfect. The members opposite are obviously familiar with the consultation process on legislation and the challenges therein. But given those challenges — and then ultimately the intervening factor of a global pandemic, of course, complicated matters further.

The letters to both the Town of Watson Lake and the Liard First Nation in the fall of 2018 sought guidance on the following: (1) the responsibility of individuals to control animals that they own, such as dogs and cats; (2) new standards for animal protection and welfare; (3) how to control domestic animals that have become “feral (living wild)”; (4) operational requirements for animal organizations, like rescues, kennels, and mushers; (5) control of exotic pets; and (6) enforcement of animal protection and control laws.

So, there does appear to be a record of having reached out. Can there be and will there be further conversations? Absolutely.

Mr. Cathers: I would just note, on behalf of my colleague, the Member for Watson Lake, that she has indicated to me that, in the community she represents — Upper Liard and Two and One-Half Mile Village, which, of course, are near Watson Lake but not within municipal limits — the dog problems in those communities have gotten worse, and the situation has changed significantly since both 2018 and 2019. She has also indicated, on behalf of her constituents in the area, that she knows that some of them would indeed welcome community consultation on the provisions of this.

I don't intend to belabour the point today about stakeholder consultation, as I have raised it many times, but again, I would point to the problem with the approach that this government has taken. Not consulting on the draft legislation with stakeholders who are directly affected by it, including businesses and organizations representing their members and including municipalities and First Nations, leads to the problem that the legislation has suffered and clearly so from that lack of consultation.

The minister himself has acknowledged that it is not perfect, and the point that I would again just make is reference to the “what we heard” document from the government on page 8, where they talked about — under the area of animal control, the section of the “what we heard” document — on page 8 of that document from 2019, it talked about next steps, including — and I quote: “Reach out to First Nations and municipal governments to further discuss building a better toolkit for animal control in communities”.

The problem with this, as I have noted in the letter that I just read into the record from Watson Lake and the concerns that I raised on behalf of my colleague and her constituents, is that the details of what is in the tool kit includes the legislation. We are hearing clearly from municipal stakeholders — including the Town of Watson Lake and the Association of Yukon Communities on behalf of other municipalities and local advisory councils — that they do want to be consulted on the details of the legislation. As my colleague noted to me, and as noted in the letter from the municipality of Watson Lake, they raised a question of why their bylaw department wasn't directly consulted. I would point out that for municipalities that do have bylaw departments that deal with enforcement may indeed be expected by citizens to enforce this legislation. I would contend that it is actually pretty key to the success or failure of legislation regarding dog control to engage those municipal partners and talk about who takes on what responsibility.

I understand that the minister had indicated that, in some cases, the Yukon government could provide that, if municipalities or other communities weren't, but the issue of whose jurisdiction it is, whose responsibility it is, whose costs, what facilities are in place to deal with any animals that are perhaps taken into government custody — all of those things have impacts. Discussing with those government partners the details of that is pretty key, and that includes discussing the legislation.

Again, we have discussed this point a number of times. The government has been clear that they intend to proceed with the legislation and not agree to those requests for consultation on the legislation. I would just again urge the minister and his colleagues to recognize that there isn't a burning need to pass this legislation here this Sitting. The government's own timelines indicated that, for regulations, the earliest they think they might have them in place is spring of next year. So, whether or not this bill is passed or paused this Sitting would not result in any enforcement or action taking place between now and spring, when they envision bringing the regulations into place. It would be an action by this Legislative Assembly, should it pass, that would still not result in any changes on the ground until the regulations themselves are in place and the act is brought into force.

Again, there is no urgency to deal with this during this Sitting, and I would encourage the minister — I doubt he is going to change his mind here today, but after the end of the Sitting here today, I would encourage him to discuss it with his Cabinet and caucus colleagues and consider doing what a growing list of stakeholders are asking for: just pausing progress on this bill, consulting on the details, similar to the better building program legislation coming back, and if any changes are necessary, making them at that point before the bill is passed — but providing that opportunity that a number of these stakeholders are asking for and requesting from government.

I want to move on to another specific area that the government — in the “what we heard” document, there was a reference to lower fines for first offences. We don't seem to see that reflected in the legislation. I guess, first, I just want to

confirm from the minister that sections, such as section 41 of the act and most parts of this legislation — that a violation of those sections — most sections of the act — is considered a general offence under section 60 of the act. I would just ask the minister if he could confirm that.

Chair: Would members like to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

Chair: Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 20, entitled *Animal Protection and Control Act*.

Is there any further general debate?

Hon. Mr. Clarke: We will certainly be responding to the Town of Watson Lake and look forward to meeting with them, going forward, but we will also provide some information indicating that at least one meeting did take place in Watson Lake.

So, I have some information from that, which I will provide in our response to Mayor Irvin.

And then there was a response that was sent back to — anyway, there is a chronology that I have been provided with, which will be provided to the Town of Watson Lake.

Can we continue to have fruitful conversations with both the Town of Watson Lake and Liard First Nation? Absolutely.

I can also indicate that we have been in contact with leadership of the Liard First Nation over the past years to provide support in dog control and direct response to more recent concerns.

I think there was a specific legislative question, which I will respond to. Not to put too fine a point on it, but there is urgency in this legislation in that we just heard from the Member for Watson Lake that there are ongoing and perhaps even escalating concerns in the Town of Watson Lake with respect to dogs at Two Mile Village as well. The Member for Watson Lake has indicated that to her colleagues.

So, this whole process of combining this legislation — the *Dog Act*, the *Pounds Act*, and the *Animal Protection Act* — is long overdue, and a lot of fantastic work has been done. I have a high degree of confidence that both the departments of Environment and of Energy, Mines and Resources — the Agriculture branch — will continue to do this great, great work going forward.

But the member opposite had a specific question. He can follow up if I have missed it, but it was whether section 41 was a general offence. Any contravention — other than a contravention listed in section 61, which deals with major offences like torture — is a general offence. Alternative penalties — so, yes, I think that's the quick answer to your question.

Regarding meetings in Watson Lake, this was an example of our ongoing conversations with First Nations, communities, businesses, and stakeholders after the formal consultation closed. Certainly, I understand that, even though this has gone

in the relatively usual timing of relatively major legislation, town councils have changed, or potentially have changed, and there has probably been turnover as well in the First Nation leadership, but we will certainly make sure that we continue with the targeted consultation and provide information to the municipalities as to what our information was with respect to the engagement that occurred.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate some of the information provided by the minister, but I do want to note that I would also ask him to share with us a copy of that information regarding the chronology of consultation that he mentioned — that he plans to send to the municipality of Watson Lake.

I would also just note that, under the section of enforcement, it was clear from the consultation that most people wanted the first penalty to be low. It seems that the penalty for a first offence under the general offences is now more than \$75,000, six months in jail, or both. It does raise a question about why there isn't a section related to minor offences.

In raising that specific question, I would turn it back to the minister and note that, at the start of the debate, he indicated today that when questions were done in general debate, he would seek to report progress prior to moving into line by line. I would invite him now to answer the question that I just asked and then to report progress so that we can move on to other items of business. The Government House Leader had identified that we would move into the budget after this today if debate wrapped up.

Hon. Mr. Clarke: So, the question is with respect to — just to confirm — first penalties and the thought around the amount and why that applies to minor offences?

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Clarke: The fines represent the maximums that would be allowed, not what might be typical. The option to impose alternative penalties was put in place because we recognize how many people cannot meet the needs of care and control of their animals because they are living on marginal incomes. Assigning them a fine is not helping them or their animals. In this case, the penalty of complying with an order and being subject to inspection would perhaps make more sense and lead to better animal care and control.

We can certainly continue that conversation about the whole penalty provisions.

I will just take this opportunity to thank the officials, Mary Vanderkop and Rebecca Veinott, for their attendance today and we will likely be welcoming them back at some point in the future during the Fall Sitting. Thank you for the opportunity to have this discussion about this important legislation today.

However, at this time, Madam Chair, I move that you report progress.

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

Motion agreed to

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

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 206, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2022-23*.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Committee of the Whole will recess for 10 minutes.

Recess

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

Bill No. 206: *Second Appropriation Act 2022-23* — continued

Deputy Chair: The matter before the Committee is continued general debate on Bill No. 206, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2022-23*.

Is there any further general debate?

Mr. Dixon: I appreciate the opportunity to return to this. I'm not sure exactly where I left off, but I do have some questions to follow up on — the items that we were speaking about when we broke last.

I want to return to some questions that I had for the Premier around the conduct of the Liberal leadership election and to comments he made in the media, both in the *Whitehorse Star* and the CBC, which I quoted last time.

I just want to start again by asking the Premier to confirm that indeed his office did seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner with regard to the setting of rules — or not — with the conflicts commissioner.

Hon. Mr. Silver: As I recall, a staff member did reach out to the commissioner.

Mr. Dixon: Does the Premier know which one of his staff members reached out to the conflicts commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Silver: No, I do not.

Mr. Dixon: The Premier was quoted in the media — in the *Whitehorse Star* — in an October 4 article entitled “Premier told to clarify leadership rules for ministers”.

The quote from that article is: “His office has spoken to the conflict of interest commissioner...”, the Premier added.

“‘She doesn’t see any conflicts either, so the Yukon Party can talk about convention as much as they possibly want,’ he said.”

So, the Premier was comfortable saying that to the media, but he is not sure who it was who actually sought the advice of the conflicts commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Yes.

Mr. Dixon: Can the Premier explain how he is confident enough to know that the advice was sought, but he doesn’t know who it was who sought the advice?

Hon. Mr. Silver: As it turns out, the only person who is really interested in this is the Leader of the Official Opposition. I am spending very little time on it. I would like to get to general debate on this budget, and the member opposite wants to continue to talk about issues that really do not pertain to this

budget. I’m not spending any more time on it, because, again, it’s just the Yukon Party that is concerned about these things. I believe, as far as what the party is doing and how we are conducting ourselves — and I have made these statements already — they are well within the parameters laid out for us. That’s pretty much all I have to say about this.

Mr. Dixon: Last time we spoke, we laid out clearly why this was important to the future of the territory. This is about the selection of the next Premier — the Premier’s successor — and some comments that the Premier made in the media about him seeking the advice or his office seeking the advice. So, I find it odd that the Premier was willing to say to the media that his office sought the advice, but now the Premier is unable to even tell us who it was who sought that advice from the conflicts commissioner. I can appreciate that perhaps someone in his office did so without him knowing exactly who, but at some point, somebody must have communicated to the Premier enough for him to feel confident enough to say this to the media. So, can the Premier at least us who told him that advice had been sought from the conflicts commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, as far as who — I will ask the member opposite: Why is it so important that I name staff in the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. Dixon: I certainly don’t require a name; I just want to know that the Premier actually knows who it was who sought the advice.

Hon. Mr. Silver: I don’t know who actually called, but at the same time, I do know that when we had our caucus meeting, it was discussed that a call was made. That’s about all I’m going to say about this.

Mr. Dixon: Okay, thank you, Deputy Chair. I will move on. It doesn’t seem like the Premier is willing to provide any information about this.

I will circle back, though, to another issue related to the conflicts commissioner, and that is our previous discussion where we broke last about the fact that the Premier is the only person who can seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner in relation to the actions of the former Minister of Health and Social Services and Yukon Housing. When we left off, the Premier was confused about whether or not members of the Legislature can seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner in relation to whether or not a former minister had contravened the act. Since then, I’m sure he has had time to read the letter that was issued to my colleague, the MLA for Pelly-Nisutlin, and then tabled.

So, now I would like to start by just asking the Premier if he will acknowledge that he is in fact the only person in this Legislature who can seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner about this matter.

Hon. Mr. Silver: It’s good that the member opposite is now clarifying the comment that it is the only person in this Legislature currently who can, but I have already spoken and answered this question as well.

The issue is whether or not a former minister who is no longer in office, who was subsequently employed by Ketza Construction — so, again, the Yukon Party obviously has concerns about Ketza Construction and their decisions. I am not

the only person who could contact the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. The person — the Ketzka employee — could as well. I am not going to. I don't see anything done — for me to make that call. However, the members opposite do. Another person who could contact the Conflict of Interest Commissioner is the Ketzka Construction employee themselves.

It is good that they are finally correcting their inaccurate statements about me being the only one who could seek that advice. Now they are saying that it's the only one in this Legislature who can seek the advice of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner on this matter, but I do not plan to seek that advice from the conflicts commissioner on this matter. I said that in Question Period when they asked me about that and again when they posed the question as “now that you had a chance to read these letters”. I think I was very clear in my comments at that time.

The Yukon Party is concerned about this matter. They should take it up with Ketzka and their employee. I stick to those comments and really don't have much more to say about that, either.

Mr. Dixon: So, just to be clear, the Premier is right. The person who has possibly contravened the act could, indeed, seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner to prove that she has contravened the act, but I don't think that is very likely. I don't think it is likely that someone would write to the conflicts commissioner and then share that advice publicly if that person believes that they have contravened the act.

If the person believed that they hadn't contravened the act, they may very well do so, and that would make all of this go away, but since that person is unlikely to self-incriminate, the only other person, other than the person in question, is the Premier. He has now finally acknowledged that, which is appreciated, but there is certainly a lot of discourse about this in the public. The Premier may dismiss all of that and say that it's just the Yukon Party, but following the coverage of this, there has been a discussion in the public about whether or not the former minister did, indeed, contravene this particular section of the conflict of interest act. The only person other than the person who potentially contravened the act who could clear the air on this is the Premier.

I would like him to explain again why he won't clear the air on this and why he won't seek the advice and share it with us so that we can move on from this issue.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Because we do not share the concerns that the Yukon Party shares; if the Yukon Party was not making an issue about this, no one would be talking about this. We don't see a reason for Ketzka Construction or any other construction company to go forward and to look at conflicts of interest. They are known to assassinate characters in the political realm. They've done it with a few of my members here —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Deputy Chair: The Member for Copperbelt North, on a point of order.

Mr. Dixon: For the member to imply that someone is conducting some sort of assassination of anything is in contravention of the Standing Orders.

Deputy Chair: The Member for Klondike, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Silver: On the point of order, this is a conflict among members, and you know, there is a lot of evidence to prove that the member opposite will say just about anything to —

Deputy Chair's ruling

Deputy Chair: Order. The temperature of the debate is rising, and I would ask members not to use language about character assassination.

The Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, I've made my comments known very well on this issue. The Yukon Party seems to have an issue with Ketzka Construction. I asked them to bring it up with Ketzka, but I don't see a conflict of interest.

Mr. Dixon: Of course, naturally, I think the Premier is inaccurate here. We have no issue with the contractor themselves; we have an issue with the contractor's employee. That is the person we feel may potentially have contravened the conflict of interest act, and it's quite clear that there are at least reasonable grounds for that. We've laid that out in our letter to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, who has since advised us that the only person who can clear this up is the Premier, other than the person in question.

So, I think it behooves the Premier to look at this issue and realize that there are reasonable grounds to at least ask the question. His own mandate letters to his ministers indicate that they should proactively reach out to the conflicts commissioner and seek his advice on matters like this. It seems that he — at least, his office did — sought the advice of the conflicts commissioner about the conduct of the Liberal leadership election.

So, why would he ask his ministers to proactively seek the advice of the conflicts commissioner, and why would he ask the conflicts commissioner about the leadership election, but he won't ask the conflicts commissioner about this matter?

Hon. Mr. Silver: The two are unrelated.

Mr. Dixon: So, the Premier has said that he won't ask for the advice of the conflicts commissioner because he doesn't believe that there is a conflict of interest. Does the Premier think that he is qualified to judge whether or not there has been a violation of the conflict of interest act?

Hon. Mr. Silver: I don't know what the member opposite wants me to say, other than what I have already said. We don't believe that there is a conflict here, and we know that the Yukon Party does. I guess we are at a stalemate here, because I am not moving forward with any advice from the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. I have watched this from the beginning, and I have watched the Yukon Party try to do a scattershot to see what sticks, and I don't see a reason to pick up the phone or to put pen to paper and talk with the commissioner about this issue.

Mr. Dixon: The Premier is right; we are at loggerheads here, and the only way to solve it would be to ask the Conflict of Interest Commissioner to weigh in. Section 10(4) of the act is quite clear — and it reads as follows: “A former Minister shall not make representations to the Government of the Yukon in relation to a transaction or negotiation to which the Government is a party and in which the former Minister was previously involved as a Minister if the representations could result in the conferring of a benefit not of general application.”

Can the Premier tell me which aspect of that section of the act doesn't apply here or is not relevant to this situation?

Hon. Mr. Silver: I can do the same. What action did the person or the company do that is this smoking gun that the Yukon Party has? Again, they can decide that they have figured something out. We have looked at this situation. There is nothing to see here, and for us to contact the Conflict of Interest Commissioner because the Yukon Party is trying their hardest to attach something to somebody who is now in the private sector — that is something that I don't want to entertain.

Mr. Dixon: I am happy to entertain the Premier with my interpretation of this section. So, it reads — and I quote: “A former Minister shall not make representations to the Government of the Yukon...” We have, in this exact case, a former minister who, by the own admission of the current minister, has made representations to the Government of Yukon. The issue is in relation to a transaction or negotiation to which the Government of Yukon is a party. This is about an ongoing contract between the Yukon government and the contractor, which is, in the case — according to the minister — discussions about that contract and therefore a transaction or a negotiation.

The subsequent section of the acts says that it applies in which the former minister was previously involved as the minister. Well, this is very much the case; this is a project that was managed by the departments the minister was responsible for. She was quoted in the news releases about the announcement of these projects. She was quite clearly involved as a minister in these, and it indicates that, if the representations could result in the conferring of a benefit, not of general application and, of course, her employment with the company is not a benefit of general application, and the benefits that could be conferred as a result of those representations would not be of general application.

So, each and every aspect of this section, I believe, is quite clearly checked. That being said, I can see that I am certainly not an expert here, and so the expert that we have on staff and paid for by the Legislative Assembly to provide us that advice and provide us the expert opinion on these matters is the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. So, as I have explained, there was quite clearly reasonable grounds to at least ask the conflicts commissioner about whether or not the former minister contravened section 10(4) of the act.

I am happy to hear if the Premier has a different opinion on that.

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, we're going over the same question over and over again. I don't share the member

opposite's concerns. If the member opposite still has a concern, he can take it up with Ketz Construction.

Mr. Dixon: Okay, I appreciate that the Premier is not going to be willing to budge on this, so I will move on. I will move on noting, of course, my disappointment in the fact that I have quite clearly laid out reasonable grounds for the Premier to seek this advice and his refusal to clear the air on this and simply ask the advice of the conflicts commissioner, which would either make this issue go away or provide clarity, at least, for legislators to understand whether or not there is a contravention of the conflict of interest act. It's the decision that the Premier has taken, though. That is disappointing, but I will move on.

Earlier this spring, we raised a question in Question Period about some federal funding in relation to affordable housing. Following the federal budget, my colleague, the MLA for Porter Creek Centre, asked a question of the government about federal funding for affordable housing. We noted that, in the federal budget, the other two territories received \$60 million each to address the housing crisis, and unfortunately, the Yukon was only given half of that. We were given \$30 million. In response to that, the Premier — and I quote: “Mr. Speaker, what the members opposite are not telling you is there is dedicated funding to three territories. That's \$60 million to Nunavut, \$60 million to Northwest Territories, and \$62.2 million to Yukon. Now, out of that, what they're also not telling...” — you — “... is that \$32.2 million did not go to the other two territories for hydro expansion.”

I would like the Premier to explain that comment to me a little bit. Is it the case that the federal government offered to each territory \$60 million for housing and the Yukon's position was that we will take \$30 million for housing and we will take \$32.2 million for the Atlin expansion?

Hon. Mr. Silver: As the member opposite would know from his time in government, you don't just spend one day asking for things from the federal government. From our perspective, in our process, we speak with our communities, our other leadership, and we make requests. As it turns out, with all the requests going forward, the federal government and how they decide this — that's up to them. The member opposite can ask the federal government why they made these decisions, but they equally gave money right across the territory. In that equality of approximately \$60 million, we had the allocation divided into two things, whereas the other two territories had it for housing specifically.

There are other pockets of money for housing, obviously. The three territories, as much as we do share, have differences as well. We have made record investments in housing and lands. As far as the budget goes and the demands of the other territories, I can't speak to how they lobby or speak with the federal government for what they need on a monthly basis or on a budget cycle basis. But yes, in the end, in that particular tranche in that particular budget, it was equal funding right across the north. Yukon had two different pieces in that.

Also, just to be fair with that number as well, 15 million of those dollars is in this supplementary budget that we are debating today.

Deputy Chair, seeing the time, I move that you report progress.

Deputy Chair: It has been moved by the Member for Klondike that the Chair report progress.

Motion agreed to

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Ms. Tredger: Mr. Speaker, Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 20, entitled *Animal Protection and Control Act*, and directed me to report progress.

Committee of the Whole has also considered Bill No. 206, entitled *Second Appropriation Act 2022-23*, and directed me to report progress.

Speaker: You have heard the report from the Deputy 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 sessional paper was filed November 2, 2022:

35-1-70

Upping Your Game on Children's Rights: 2021/2022 Annual Report — Yukon Child and Youth Advocate Office (Speaker Harper)

The following legislative returns were tabled November 2, 2022:

35-1-66

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Istchenko related to a ministerial statement re: Kêts'ádañ Kù project (McLean)

35-1-67

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Dixon related to a ministerial statement re: early learning and childcare programs — Child Development Centre (McLean)

35-1-68

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Mr. Dixon related to a ministerial statement re: early learning and childcare programs — early kindergarten (McLean)

The following document was filed November 2, 2022:

35-1-105

Animal Protection Act, letter re (dated November 2, 2022) from Christopher Irvin, Mayor, Town of Watson Lake to Hon. Nils Clarke, Minister of Environment (McLeod)

Written notice was given of the following motion November 2, 2022:

Motion No. 514

Re: removing GST on some expenses (Mr. Cathers)