



Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 87

2nd Session

34th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 18, 2018 — 1:00 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Nils Clarke

YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

2018 Spring Sitting

SPEAKER — Hon. Nils Clarke, MLA, Riverdale North
DEPUTY SPEAKER and CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Don Hutton, MLA, Mayo-Tatchun
DEPUTY CHAIR OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Ted Adel, MLA, Copperbelt North

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

Yukon Liberal Party

Ted Adel	Copperbelt North
Paolo Gallina	Porter Creek Centre
Don Hutton	Mayo-Tatchun

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Yukon Party

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

THIRD PARTY

New Democratic Party

Liz Hanson	Leader of the Third Party Whitehorse Centre
Kate White	Third Party House Leader Takhini-Kopper King

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Floyd McCormick
Deputy Clerk	Linda Kolody
Clerk of Committees	Allison Lloyd
Sergeant-at-Arms	Karina Watson
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms	Harris Cox
Hansard Administrator	Deana Lemke

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, April 18, 2018 — 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 with the Order Paper.
Tributes.

TRIBUTES

In recognition of 25th anniversary of the Recreation and Parks Association of the Yukon

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I rise today to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the Recreation and Parks Association of the Yukon — or RPAY — and the only thing that would make me more excited, Mr. Speaker, is if we were doing it outside.

For the past 25 years, RPAY has worked in the Yukon to promote healthy, active living across the territory with a focus on rural communities. It was founded in 1993 following the breaking trails conference, which brought together government, community groups, First Nations and recreation practitioners. We actually have a couple of those folks who were here back in 1993 with us today. RPAY works closely with organizations and communities to create environments that encourage recreation and parks opportunities for all Yukoners. They love the outdoors. RPAY's actions contribute to the quality of life and well-being of all Yukon residents.

Beyond active living, RPAY also promotes healthy lifestyles through physical activity, healthy eating and stress reduction. RPAY offers unique programs like winter active for life, which encourages Yukoners to stay active outdoors during the long winter months by lending cross-country and snowshoe gear from its equipment library. I know that I have borrowed some when I worked at the Marsh Lake Community Centre. I understand now that they are adding kicksleds that have gone all the way up to Old Crow. It's amazing.

Other programs like active schools collaborate with teachers to promote daily physical activity in schools. RPAY has also developed a focus on the after-school time period encouraging children and youth to be physically active after school. Together, these programs and more are helping Yukoners, young and old, lead happier, healthier and more active lives.

In 2015, RPAY, alongside partners from the other territories, received a portion of the Arctic Inspiration Prize to begin work on a pilot program that will train recreation leaders across the north. The pilot will wrap up this year and we look forward to the continued success of this program. RPAY has a large focus on building capacity for recreation leaders in our communities — for example, by holding the annual recreation gathering for leaders across Yukon to come together for training opportunities. I had the opportunity to speak at that conference just last year.

RPAY is dedicated to recreation, not only for Yukoners, but for all northerners, and it has been steadfastly forward-thinking in its action. What RPAY does across Yukon makes a real difference.

Recreation has so many benefits, from building stronger families and communities to improving personal health. It is so important that we inspire our communities to get up and get moving. Whether it's getting someone started on cross-country skiing, keeping kids active in school or inspiring adults to get out and explore a new trail, you are helping all Yukoners to stay healthy and active and to have fun.

If they had a motto, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be: Do we stop climbing trees because we grow old, or do we grow old because we stop climbing trees?

It is through your hard work and dedication that this is all possible. I want to say thank you on behalf of us as legislators and the Yukon government for your efforts to provide quality recreation opportunities across the Yukon, and I hope that your next 25 years will be just as successful.

Applause

Ms. Van Bibber: I rise on behalf of the Yukon Party Official Opposition to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the Recreation and Parks Association of the Yukon, or RPAY.

RPAY puts Yukoners' health first. They offer recreation leadership, aquatics and fitness programs, in addition to children's programs and promotional activities. The list of programs and workshops offered are amazing: Yu Move 2 Learn for increased school participation and physical activity, kids in the kitchen, Nordic walking, cross-country skiing and workshops ranging from community gardening to seniors snowshoeing, to name a few more.

RPAY truly provides something for everyone who wants to participate. There is even a section called "Winter Active for Life", and a question: "Did you know that being outdoors in the cold is good for you?" Well, this year, we must be a healthy bunch because it's still cold.

I was part of that Arctic Inspiration Prize National Selection Committee for many years, and we had the distinct pleasure of choosing RPAY as a recipient of the prize in 2015 for their tri-territorial recreation training project. The project focused on the development and delivery of a specialized community recreation leadership training program in rural and remote communities across the north. Nominated by Yukon Olympian cyclist Zach Bell, who was in attendance at the awards ceremony in Ottawa, the pan-territorial project received \$600,000 to aid in the delivery of their project. In that same year, the governments of Canada and Yukon announced the Yukon Northern Wellness Project with \$2 million in funding to be distributed to Yukon organizations with a focus on encouraging active living for children and youth in Yukon. RPAY was a chosen recipient, and the funding helps to support programs like the equipment lending library with loans to rural communities of cross-country ski equipment and snowshoes.

It is well-known that physical and emotional health are benefits of exercise for all ages. It provides a balance, reduces

antisocial behaviour, reduces health care costs and gives one a definite quality of life. I would like to thank RPAY's executive director, Anne Morgan, as well as all the RPAY staff and recreation directors. Well done — and keep up the good work.

Applause

Ms. White: I rise on behalf of the Yukon NDP caucus to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Recreation and Parks Association of the Yukon, or, if you want to have it roll off your tongue, you probably know it as RPAY.

We congratulate members past and present for the work that has been done to help Yukoners live healthy, active lives. We appreciate that, through the work of RPAY, Yukon communities have never looked or felt so good and that everyone from the very young to the very old are being shown the importance and fun of what being active means. If you are ever unsure of what sticks in the knowledge that you share when dressing for cold-weather activities, know that the line, "Be bold or be cold", lives on the tips of tongues everywhere in the territory — mine included.

Thank you for the leadership, the vision and, of course, all of the fun that you bring the territory. Congratulations on your first quarter of a century, and we look forward to seeing what you do in the next 25 years.

Applause

In recognition of World Heritage Day

Hon. Ms. Dendys: I rise today on behalf of the Liberal government to pay tribute to World Heritage Day. Today, we join together with communities around the globe to commemorate the importance of our heritage. Preserving, protecting and interpreting our heritage is the work of many here in Yukon: our First Nation and municipal governments, industry and individual partners, and the many people supporting our archaeology and palaeontology research and resource management programs, historic sites, museums and cultural centres across the territory. These heritage resources form a tangible record of the people, events and activities that have shaped our way of life and our environment. Through our family histories, oral traditions, visual, performing and literary arts, we are able to bring our heritage to life and ensure that it is never forgotten.

Yukon is home to a number of designated heritage protected areas. This includes 12 national historic sites, nine Yukon historic sites, 20 municipal historic sites, three national parks and a number of territorial parks, such as Tombstone, and a range of other protected areas.

Yukon is also home to sites that have international heritage significance. Three of these sites are on Canada's tentative list for UNESCO world heritage site designation. The Tr'ondëk-Klondike site was added to Canada's tentative list of historic sites in 2004. It is an outstanding example of an evolving gold rush landscape that illustrates the iconic Klondike Gold Rush of the 19th century. It offers a representation of an indigenous people's continuing relationship with their lands, which was maintained despite

the impacts of the gold rush. It also offers an intact mining landscape that reveals the magnitude of the event and the ongoing evolution of placer and gold mining.

Ivvavik/Vuntut/Herschel Island is an outstanding example of a landscape that illustrates the very early human occupation of northwest America via the Bering land bridge between Asia and North America. It is also an example of traditional land use representation by two distinct aboriginal cultural traditions adapting to the challenging environment.

Most recently, the federal government added the Yukon ice patches in Carcross/Tagish First Nation traditional territory to Canada's tentative list for UNESCO World Heritage Sites. The Yukon ice patches are some of the most important archaeological sites of their kind in the world. The project began in 1998, in partnership with six First Nations. Due to climate change, ice patches are melting and revealing unprecedented collections of remarkably preserved ancient hunting tools and other artifacts. Should these three sites receive recognition as UNESCO World Heritage Sites, they will join the Kluane/Wrangell-St. Elias/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini-Elsek World Heritage Site, an impressive complex of glaciers and high peaks on all sides of the border between Yukon, British Columbia and Alaska.

Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today and what we will pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritages are both sources of life and inspiration. Today and every day, let us recognize that these sites belong to everyone and must be preserved and protected for generations to come.

We have a number of guests, and I'll introduce and acknowledge them in a few moments. Thank you so much for coming here today.

Applause

Ms. Van Bibber: I rise today on behalf of the Official Opposition and the Third Party to recognize World Heritage Day. Today, April 18, is the International Day for Monuments and Sites, commonly known as World Heritage Day, and this day is celebrated around the world.

The theme for 2018 is "Heritage for Generations". It means just that — we must preserve our historical assets and knowledge for future generations.

We are fortunate to be home to a number of sites in Yukon that are natural or historic landmarks. Our UNESCO World Heritage Site lies in the Kluane/Wrangell-St. Elias/Glacier Bay/Tatshenshini-Elsek parks. These parks span southwestern Yukon into British Columbia and the United States. They are a natural wonder and home to many birds and animals. Within the site lies the largest non-polar icefield in the world.

To the adventurous traveller, there is no shortage of sites to visit. Each highway and community has something different to offer. Ivvavik and Vuntut national parks, Tombstone Territorial Park, Fort Selkirk, Montague Roadhouse, Sheep Mountain, MacBride Museum and the Sign Post Forest are only a few of the attractions you can find across the Yukon.

I would like to congratulate MacBride Museum director Patricia Cuning and staff, as they do an amazing job of community outreach to connect in so many fun ways to make history relevant and exciting.

Sharing and transferring knowledge to our youth is essential. Encourage them to participate with seniors and elders so that they become the people who continue to understand the value of their place in heritage.

I see cultural heritage simply as living one's life in a way that shows who they are and how they live with their traditions. On this one day, April 18, we join to celebrate all history and heritage of the human race. I would like to encourage Yukoners to explore their territory's heritage and take in the attractions that it has to offer.

Enjoy World Heritage Day.

Applause

Speaker: Introduction of visitors.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I would like us all to welcome here today folks who are here from RPAY, including the president, Ian Spencer. Ian has been the rec director for Mayo for many years and he is going on 15 years as the president — I mean, that kind of continuity really makes a difference; board member Jim Boyde; we had Kathy Zrum here as well. I would also like to give a shout-out to Anne Morgan, the amazing executive director for RPAY. We have, as well, from the folks who work at RPAY, Penny Sheardown, Caroline Sparks and Jan Downing. Caroline and Jan, I think, were there in 1993 when they started to break trail in helping to keep Yukoners active. I thank them very much.

Applause

Hon. Ms. Dendys: I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to help me in welcoming our wonderful guests here today. We have: Sheila Greer, who is the heritage manager for Champagne and Aishihik First Nations; we have Richard Smith, cultural programmer for Champagne and Aishihik First Nations; and Derek Cooke, who is heritage technician for the Ta'an Kwäch'än Council and the Yukon Council of Archives. We have a number of our staff here today from Tourism and Culture: Valerie Royle, who is the deputy minister; Clare Daitch; Shannon Van Bibber; Joel LeBaron; and Graeme Poile, I believe. I would also like to acknowledge Jessie Stephen, who is my executive assistant.

I thank all of you for all of the hard work that you do on behalf of all Yukoners and thank you so much for coming here today to be part of this tribute.

Applause

Ms. White: I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging also that Jim Boyde — not only is he involved, of course, in RPAY, but he is one of the driving forces behind the ACES program in the territory — experiential learning on the land, and out doing activities. It is

interesting that you're still involved with RPAY — I mean, how could you walk away?

Thank you so much for being here and ACES — we're, like, 40 years strong at this point — so congratulations on that achievement.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any further introductions of visitors?

Are there any returns or documents for tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I have for tabling the Yukon Law Foundation annual report for 2016-17, which is tabled pursuant to section 150.2 of the *Legal Profession Act*.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I have for tabling two legislative returns: one regarding questions about the F.H. Collins track and field facility, and another regarding questions about buried fuel tanks for mobile homes.

Ms. McLeod: I have for tabling today a letter to the Auditor General of Canada requesting a performance audit of Family and Children's Services.

Hon. Ms. Frost: I have for tabling a response to a question raised by the Member for Kluane on March 22, 2018.

Mr. Cathers: I have for tabling a written question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources regarding Fox Lake local area plan.

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

Are there any reports of committees?

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Gallina: I have for tabling the second report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, dated April 17, 2018.

Speaker: Are there any further committee reports to be presented?

Are there any petitions?

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 for the production of papers:

THAT this House urges the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to table the 2017 Yukon Minerals Advisory Board report prior to the end of the Spring Sitting.

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to implement the federal carbon-pricing mechanism while

considering the Yukon Financial Advisory Panel's findings that:

- (1) fuel use in Yukon is the lowest taxed of any jurisdiction in Canada by a wide margin; and
- (2) a tax exemption for any economic sector constitutes a form of subsidy.

Mr. Gallina: I rise to give notice of the following motion respecting committee reports:

THAT the second report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, presented to the House on April 18, 2018, be concurred in; and

THAT the amendments to Standing Order 11, recommended by the committee, be adopted.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motions?
Is there a statement by a minister?
This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Carbon tax

Mr. Kent: During the election, the Premier and the rest of the Liberal candidates went door to door and told Yukoners not to worry that their carbon tax would increase the cost of everything because they promised they would get all that money back. Unfortunately, as with many things that the Liberals promised, it turns out to have been a work of fiction. In fact, I would like to read a quote from the Premier during the election campaign. This is from CHON FM on October 17, 2016. The Premier said — and I quote: “If you look at the three platforms, as far as that goes, 100 percent stays in your pocket for Yukon Liberal Party.”

Black and white, the Premier promised Yukoners that 100 percent would stay in their pockets. However, yesterday when we asked the Premier why he was breaking this promise, he shockingly suggested that Yukoners were naïve for believing him.

Mr. Speaker, Yukoners trusted the Premier and it is an insult that he would suggest that they are naïve for taking him and the Liberals at their word. Will the Premier apologize to Yukoners for calling them naïve and for breaking his promise that they will get all of their money back as a result of his carbon tax scheme?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, here we go with the Yukon Party. I said that the Yukon public is not that naïve.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well known what a carbon-pricing mechanism does. To be asked the same question in the Legislative Assembly over and over again is not going to change our point of view, which is that 100 percent of the funds that will be collected from a federal carbon-pricing mechanism in this region will be given back to Yukoners and Yukon businesses. Within that statement, we are still figuring out how the final stages of that rebate will be figured out. But again, the Yukon Party likes to parse the words out and try to say: “Well, one day, you said it was the Yukon and the next day, you say it is the Yukon — which one is it?” We keep saying the same thing: 100 percent of the money will not stay

in our pockets; it will go to Yukoners and to Yukon businesses.

Mr. Kent: What has changed is the Premier's promise that he made to Yukoners during the election. During the election the Premier said — and I quote: “If you look at the three platforms, as far as that goes, 100 percent stays in your pocket for Yukon Liberal Party.” However, yesterday, we asked him a number of simple yes-or-no questions about whether people will get all of their money back. In fact, my colleague from Lake Laberge asked — if one of his constituents pays over \$1,100 extra in carbon tax, whether or not they will get all of that money back. Based on the Premier's comments during the election that, in his words — again I quote: “100 percent stays in your pocket” — the answer to my colleague's question should have been a simple yes. Unfortunately, his answer was to call Yukoners naïve for believing him during the election.

Will the Premier honour his original commitment that every Yukoner will get 100 percent of their money back from the carbon tax — yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, Mr. Speaker, we committed in the campaign promise that we were going to give 100 percent of that money back to Yukoners. Now, again, the naïveté comes from the Yukon Party, which would actually believe that every single nickel given out from every single pocket is going to go back into every single pocket.

Mr. Speaker, we have never said that. What we did say is that 100 percent of the money goes back to Yukoners and Yukon businesses. They can parse words about the collective “we” or the collective “they”, but Yukoners know better. Yukoners know that, during the election campaign, the Yukon Party had no solution except to put their heads in the sand and say, “No, we don't want to have this” — whereas we said that the best thing we can do is put money into retrofits, put money into initiatives for the Yukon — from our government perspective — but make sure that the money that is collected in the Yukon goes back to Yukon businesses and Yukon individuals.

I don't how much clearer we need to be, Mr. Speaker — 100 percent of the money goes back to Yukoners and Yukon businesses. I do believe we have been saying that over and over again for over two years now, and, over and over again, the Yukon Party has said, “We don't think we are going to do anything about the federal carbon-pricing mechanism.” We had conversations with placer miners at the door. We had conversations with business owners. We had conversations with other governments, and we remain committed to making sure that this carbon-pricing mechanism is revenue neutral but still is a carbon-pricing mechanism.

Question re: Carbon tax

Mr. Cathers: Regarding the \$26-million Liberal carbon tax, we now hear the Premier claiming that he never said what he said on October 17, 2016, during the election campaign when he promised Yukoners — and I quote: “If you look at the three platforms, as far as that goes, 100 percent stays in your pocket for the Yukon Liberal Party.” Over the

course of the last week, we have seen the Premier breaking another promise to Yukoners and will not be giving all of their money back. When we asked him about this yesterday, he suggested that any Yukoner who believed the words that he said during the election campaign was naïve.

Can the Premier tell us, regarding the Liberal carbon tax rebate scheme, if I have a constituent who pays over \$1,100 a year as a result of this new tax, how much will they get back? Will it be a couple of dollars, \$100 or zero dollars?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, we get the Yukon Party basically not even understanding the words that are coming out of our mouths here in the Legislative Assembly.

Yukoners are not as naïve — listening to the Yukon Party parse out words here and there. We have been very clear about what a carbon-pricing mechanism is. It's clear that the Yukon Party has no clue what a carbon-pricing mechanism is. By the way, I will let the Yukon Party recognize this — this wasn't invented in Canada. This has been happening nationally and internationally for years — what carbon pricing is as a concept. Yukoners know what a carbon-pricing mechanism is. They know exactly how that works.

What is still to be parsed out is exactly the details of how that rebate looks. We are looking forward to getting more information from Ottawa. We're looking forward to working with the chamber of commerce, we're looking forward to all of the documentation that we got — the "what we heard" documentation — and listening to Yukoners as to how those rebates come back.

This is just pure gamesmanship on behalf of the Yukon Party to say that every nickel is going to go back into the pocket of every single individual, because that was never the commitment — 100 percent of the money will go back to Yukoners and Yukon businesses. They're taking one quote from one interview in one radio station — that's great. That's fine. Yukoners, again, are not that naïve. They know exactly what our commitment was, they know that we're working on the rebate, and that money will be 100 percent rebated to Yukoners and Yukon businesses.

Mr. Cathers: I have to point out that, when we quoted the Premier's own words back to him, he's now telling us that Yukoners weren't naïve enough to believe him. Yukoners took him at his word during the 2016 election campaign. The Premier can try to pretend that he didn't say what he said in October 2016, but unfortunately those words are on record.

The Premier's words and actions and his plan are going to hurt Yukoners. During the election, the Premier promised that individual Yukoners would get all of their money back with rebates of the carbon tax. His exact words were: "If you look at the three platforms, as far that goes, 100 percent stays in your pocket for Yukon Liberal Party." It was a clear statement. The Premier is now renegeing on that promise and is telling us that anyone who is surprised that he isn't living up to his word is naïve. Worse, he won't give Yukoners details about how this rebate structure will actually work.

Will the Premier stop and tell the Yukon families worried about the \$26-million carbon tax and tell us how this rebate

scheme will work, rather than telling them they were naïve to believe him in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Silver: Again, I said that Yukoners are not as naïve as the Yukon Party would have them believe.

We stand behind our political commitment to Yukoners that 100 percent of that money is going to go back into Yukoners' pockets.

Here is the thing, Mr. Speaker — the Yukon Party signed on to the Vancouver Declaration, committing the Yukon to carbon pricing. Now here we have them saying that they don't want to see carbon pricing. The only party that has been flip-flopping on their commitments and on their directions — well, I think that the members opposite need to look at themselves in the mirror on that. We've been very committed to this. We have been very committed to the fact that we believe that carbon pricing is a proven, cost-effective way of reducing emissions, fostering innovation for low-carbon alternatives and providing certainty to the industry — something that they didn't get from the Yukon Party.

Again we have been very, very clear on our commitment. It's always a great opportunity to get up in the Legislative Assembly and continue the messaging that Yukoners will receive 100 percent of the carbon-pricing mechanism, Yukoners and Yukon businesses.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to be clear in that promise. Again, we've been very, very clear on our commitment. So it's always a great opportunity to get up in the Legislative Assembly and continue the messaging that Yukoners will receive 100 percent of the carbon-pricing mechanism — Yukoners and Yukon businesses.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to again be clear in that promise.

Question re: Microbiology laboratory testing

Ms. White: There has been a lot of media coverage of the microbiology laboratory at Whitehorse General Hospital over the last few months. The lab is where samples gathered at Whitehorse General Hospital, the Dawson and Watson Lake community hospitals and community health centres are sent by health care providers to be tested. It has been reported that the hospital is considering outsourcing these samples to an institution outside of Yukon. This would, among other issues, increase the delays in getting these results back and reduce the ability for decisions that affect Yukoners to be made quickly.

Can the minister tell this House whether the Hospital Corporation has made a decision on the outsourcing of microbiology services?

Hon. Ms. Frost: I'm not, at the moment, able to respond to the question. I would have to defer the question to the Hospital Corporation. I would be happy to provide a response.

Ms. White: It's important to note that the minister is responsible for the Hospital Corporation and setting health service priorities.

Concerns have been raised that sending these samples out for testing to an Outside laboratory could potentially double the wait-time for sample results. For communities sending

samples in for testing, the wait would be even longer. A sample coming from Old Crow, for example, would first need to be transported to Whitehorse and then on to the laboratory outside of Yukon.

Can the minister tell this House why having timely test results for physicians and patients is not a priority for this government?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Mr. Speaker, I would beg to differ. With regard to the statement that was made with respect to it not being a priority — most certainly, health and collaborative care is a priority. We are working diligently with the Hospital Corporation. I do believe that the CEO of the Hospital Corporation has provided a clear response with respect to the debate and the question today. I would be happy to provide that response back and I would be happy to go back to the Hospital Corporation to see where the status of that is. My understanding is that they have addressed it. We provided the response. I would be happy to bring that back again.

Ms. White: Just to remind the minister, it's the money of Yukon citizens that funds Yukon hospitals and it's the minister who is responsible for the Yukon Hospital Corporation. Yukoners understand that the need to spend our health care dollars wisely and focus on health outcomes, minimizing delays in diagnoses and getting timely information to health care providers just makes good sense.

Microbiology testing represents a small portion of the lab services provided, but it's an important service. The Hospital Corporation has said that they share the desire to improve health services in Yukon, where feasible. The hospital and the Yukon Hospital Foundation have raised and spent millions of dollars over the last few years to bring in equipment and infrastructure to increase our capacity to have health services delivered here in Yukon.

Why would we not want to see this same commitment for up-to-date equipment right here in our hospital to complete microbiology tests that are so important to patients and their health care providers?

Hon. Ms. Frost: Most certainly, the priority for Yukoners and for our relationship with the Hospital Corporation is to ensure that we provide priority services. We know that the Hospital Corporation has some key priorities. We have spent significant resources on building the new Emergency wing at the hospital. We're trying to balance the resources and we are working with the Hospital Corporation right now with respect to the microbiology lab, and the assessments are a priority.

We certainly want to ensure that the patients or clients that are in much need of this service are top priority and that the hospital — I am sure, and I can assure the member opposite and Yukoners, that delays will not result as the member opposite is perhaps insinuating.

We will ensure that all of the services are of the utmost priority and we will ensure that we work with the Hospital Corporation, both in Watson Lake and Dawson City, to look at a collaborative care model for all of Yukon. We will maximize those facilities, which we haven't done historically.

Question re: Mining sector development

Mr. Hassard: On Monday, I asked the Premier about a promise that was made by himself in March of last year by a press release, to — and I quote: "... address industry concerns around timelines and re-assessments through a collaborative framework." We know industry is frustrated with this government as it took over a year to schedule a one-hour meeting; further, according the Chamber of Mines, this meeting was little more than a meet-and-greet and sparse on details.

I am wondering if the Premier could please give us a timeline for when the collaborative framework will be finalized.

Hon. Mr. Pillai: I think it is important to tell the whole story on what has happened with both Yukon government departments and industry as well. We have heard it from a couple of members across the way that there has been this one particular meeting and that is all that has transpired. That certainly is not accurate. There have been meetings as we have gone along with industry to understand where their concerns are and also to get direction from them on short-term strategies that they believe to be effective ways to go forward post-C-17.

We have said over and over again that we do believe that to restore the trust and respect in our relationships, we would have a sign-off at a trilateral level, which is with the federal government and First Nation governments first. If we pre-determined outcomes or we jumped ahead, we would be acting in the same way that had happened previously. We feel that the legal challenges and the conflicts that arose from that type of interaction are detrimental to the industry.

There was a short meeting; the meeting was really about Aboriginal Relations briefing industry on what they are doing with First Nation governments, but that is not the whole picture. I commend the people at Energy, Mines and Resources who continue to work and we will continue to move forward with solutions to bring certainty.

Mr. Hassard: Regarding that one-hour meet-and-greet with the mining industry that the government took over a year to schedule, as I said, I would just like to read a quote from the Chamber of Mines from yesterday's *Whitehorse Star*: "It wasn't clear about how and if industry is even going to be involved moving forward, there's no set time-frame, there's no structure, there's no timelines, and there's no commitment to meet again, so it's just not clear at this stage."

What is clear is that industry is becoming frustrated with this government. Will the government agree to set a time frame for the completion of the collaborative framework, and will they agree to set up regular meetings with industry to discuss this issue?

Hon. Mr. Silver: It is always a good opportunity to clear the air when it comes to these meetings. It is important to note that Bill C-17 received royal assent on December 14, 2017.

This is an important issue for Energy, Mines and Resources and for Aboriginal Relations, but again, we had to go through years of S-6 and then, of course, into C-17, which

really set this process back by years — plural. To insinuate that we haven't met with industry for over a year, that is not true. This meeting took awhile, but again, we had to go through this process.

We do know that industry has requested a collaborative framework and is waiting for a response, including how they will have an opportunity to represent their interests at the reset MOU table. A meeting with industry did take place, as the member opposite told us. We are absolutely looking forward — this is an important issue because this is a really important topic to get back on track. The previous government decided to unilaterally make decisions when it came to YESAA and when it came to the five-year review, and that is where we are today, Mr. Speaker.

The oversight group will bring the parties together to discuss issues and provide guidance and recommendations by consensus — by consensus, Mr. Speaker — something that didn't happen in the past. I commend the minister and his hard work and the Department of Aboriginal Relations as well for all the good work they're doing fixing this mess.

Question re: Carbon tax

Mr. Cathers: Regarding the \$26-million Liberal carbon tax, we hear lots of spin from the government that they are waiting for instructions from Ottawa, but when we ask simple questions, we get non-answers. Yesterday, I asked the Premier a simple question about the carbon tax and got another of his non-answers.

We know the goods and services tax will be applied on top of a carbon tax. Will the Premier tell us if the GST revenues generated from the carbon tax will be returned to Yukoners — yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Silver: I think we have been very clear and we have responded to these questions quite often. As far as GST, I believe that would be a question for the federal government as well. I mean, it's a federal tax, the last time I checked. We have been very clear what our responsibilities are. We have been talking about the pan-Canadian framework and the work there to make sure that Ottawa recognizes the unique circumstances that are here in the north and to make sure that business does not get penalized just for trying to do work in the north. We have also been very clear on our concerns that marginalized individuals — people with lower socio-economic status — also are not penalized. Again, Mr. Speaker, these are the responses that we have given from our government perspective.

When it comes to GST considerations, that conversation has been had on a federal level with the Council of the Federation and again, that is a question that Ottawa needs to answer.

Mr. Cathers: We just heard again the Premier is telling us he is waiting for the Ottawa Liberals to tell him how it is going to be and he will just apparently accept that.

It is a simple question. The government has not been transparent and despite the Premier's claims, he has not answered the questions. Again, it is a simple question and the

fact that the Premier refuses to give a simple yes-or-no answer is concerning.

Will Yukoners get back the extra GST they pay as a result of the Liberal carbon tax — yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Silver: As the Minister of Finance, last time I checked, GST is collected in Ottawa.

Question re: Social housing

Ms. Van Bibber: The social and senior housing wait-list has skyrocketed and has grown from 105 people in July 2016 to 263 last month.

The Minister responsible for Yukon Housing Corporation has told us that, as part of the housing agreement that she signed with Canada, Yukon has developed targets for increasing the territory's social housing stock. The minister has told us that these targets have been developed, but we have asked her several times in this House to tell us what those targets are, and she has been unable to. Unfortunately, this looks like another case of the minister not being aware of what is going on in her department.

Will the minister please tell us what Yukon's targets are?

Hon. Ms. Frost: I would be happy to respond. Yes, I do know what is happening within the Yukon Housing Corporation. We just went through the budget debate. The member opposite asked significant questions with respect to the budget and the key priority areas and the focus. We were able to provide that, and I would be happy to speak about that. We also addressed the fact that we are proceeding with a Housing First initiative — the first of its kind in Yukon. I can note that this was never a conversation historically. We are now proceeding with the 16-unit facility to allow for appropriate housing for those who are challenged in finding accommodations.

We are working with the Housing Corporation and our partners to seek alternative arrangements for some of the pressure areas that we are seeing in the Yukon, specifically in some of the larger municipal communities. We are working with our partners and, as noted, I am not going to give specific numbers as to how many units are identified in each community until we have resolved with our communities what projects they would like to proceed with. At this point in time, I can give some specific numbers. We are doing major retrofits and renovations on our social housing units to divert single-family units into duplexes. We are doing further projects, and I would be happy to respond to supplementary questions.

Ms. Van Bibber: Last week, the minister told this House that Yukon has a target for expanding social housing. I asked this minister what the target was, and she did not answer. I then asked the minister of housing whether or not she knows what Yukon's target is, and her response was — and I quote: "... I am not going to give a yes-or-no answer..." Well, it is a yes-or-no answer, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us: Yes or no — does she know what the target is?

Hon. Ms. Frost: The member opposite provided in her opening statements — our social housing wait-list changes monthly. We know that. That list has been there for quite a

long time. The members opposite were quite involved in designing targets and didn't do so when they cancelled the affordable housing project in 2013. We are now proceeding with addressing the lists and the pressures. We have some communities that do not have any social housing units in their communities. We want to be able to provide resources.

With respect to the pressures on giving yes-or-no answers in the Legislative Assembly, we will work with our communities and seek the partnerships — perhaps the members opposite have not done that historically — working with the First Nation communities, the development corporations and the private sector to address major shortfalls and pressures in our communities with respect to investments in affordable housing programs.

We have just highlighted some key funding areas that we are hoping to advance our partnerships on — the developer build loan and increases in First Nation housing initiatives. We have retrofit resources in our budget to allow for new approaches for supports to private sectors as well.

Ms. Van Bibber: Under this minister's watch, the social and seniors housing wait-list has massively increased from 105 to 263. We have asked her over the course of the last two Sittings to tell us what she was going to do to reduce the wait-list. Unfortunately, all we get are conflicting talking points that don't answer the question. Can the minister tell us: Of the \$6 million identified for affordable housing in the budget, how much will the housing wait-list be reduced as a result of this funding?

Hon. Ms. Frost: The Yukon Housing Corporation will see applications submitted for proposals and will see partnerships.

With respect to what we're doing for the seniors and what we are doing to ensure that we provide supports, we have the home first initiative, which is new. We have provided more resources to keep our senior citizens in their homes longer. We are working with our partners. We're working with the home care team. We are working with our communities as well. We're opening up a facility in Little Salmon Carmacks. We are working on investments. We are working on social housing and seniors housing and we will do so as the year evolves, and we will work with our partners to identify key priority areas for keeping our elders, our senior citizens, in their homes longer. Noting that a lot of the resources have been put in a Whitehorse-centric approach and model, we want to make sure that rural Yukon communities have an opportunity to access some of the funding, and that's how it's being designed.

Question re: Mobile-homeowners

Ms. White: While the government likes to say that they are taking action on housing, there is one fact that no one can dispute, and that's that they have done nothing to improve the conditions for mobile-homeowners. Mobile homes are the most affordable way to access property in Yukon, but it comes with a key challenge.

Despite their name, mobile homes are not very mobile. In fact, a government survey answered by hundreds of mobile-

homeowners showed that 73 percent of them could not move their home if needed, either because they couldn't afford it or because the structure wouldn't survive a move. The fact that Yukon's law allows for evictions without cause and unlimited yearly pad rent increases puts these homeowners in a very vulnerable position, yet the minister has yet to address these issues. Will the minister hear the call from these homeowners and ban evictions without cause in mobile home parks?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I recall us debating this very suggestion here in the Legislature earlier — maybe it was the last session, I'm not sure. We had a thorough discussion about it.

No, we're not intending to ban evictions without cause, but I want to talk about how, in all jurisdictions, they have "with cause" clauses that are broader than ours are here. It's not an apples-to-apples comparison.

We also have protections that allow that this won't happen at a time of year when it would be difficult — in the winter months. We're not planning to change it. I thank the member opposite for her continued suggestion. We are going to continue to support our mobile-homeowners through the residential tenancies office.

Ms. White: Evictions without cause are banned in several provinces and the sky hasn't fallen.

There is no balance of the rights of mobile-homeowners and the park owners when evictions without cause are allowed. When three quarters of mobile-homeowners are not able to move their homes, it gives all the power to the park owner. The fact that this minister will not do anything about it shows that he is not there for the hundreds of mobile-homeowners in Whitehorse.

Mobile-homeowners have been fighting for years to ban evictions without cause, and they have told the government what they need over and over again, and this minister won't act. Why is the minister refusing to respond to the concerns of the most vulnerable homeowners in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I'm not refusing to act. I'm just not agreeing to act specifically in the way the member opposite wants. That's fine.

I did just describe that it isn't so simple as to suggest that the "without cause" clause in the Yukon is the same in the other provinces and territories. Their "with cause" clauses are much broader and, therefore, they are very enabling. So it isn't so simple.

I'm happy to work with mobile-homeowners through the residential tenancies office. I have reached out across to the member opposite. I hope I have responded to every one of her concerns that she has raised about mobile-homeowners. I just want to reiterate here that I'm happy to work with them if they are having challenges.

Ms. White: The minister's words are cold comfort to the hundreds of mobile-homeowners who have no protections against eviction without cause.

It's simple: three quarters of mobile-homeowners would be unable to move their homes if they had to. We have seen it in recent years. Mobile home park owners can evict them without cause. That leaves a permanent threat of losing their

home hanging over their heads. The only person who can remove this threat is the minister; yet again, we heard that he refuses.

How is this current government any different from the previous government as far as mobile-homeowners are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I'll just suggest one way that we are different from the past government. In the first few weeks, the member opposite reached out to me and I responded. I went down and had a conversation with her. From her own words at that time — I asked about how it was in the past. What she said to me was that she had never been able to meet with the Minister of Community Services on this topic before. So there is a difference.

I have encouraged Members of this Legislative Assembly who have mobile homes within their ridings to work together. I expect that we have different opinions. That is fine. I respect that there are differences of opinions here. That doesn't mean that we don't care about mobile-homeowners. Please — if there are concerns, I'm happy to address them.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed.

We will now proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair (Mr. Hutton): Order, please.

The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation 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. No. 15: *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is continuing general debate on Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*.

Mr. Streicker has 18 minutes and 26 seconds.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I certainly won't take 18 minutes and 26 seconds. All I really want to do is to just welcome our colleagues to the Legislature today to continue our discussion on the *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*.

I would like to welcome: Matt King, who is the president of the Yukon Liquor Corporation; Sandra Markman, who is, I think, one of our senior drafters in the territorial government; and Patricia Randell, who has been doing, I would say, the lead work on all of this and has been part of the many meetings that we have had out there in the Yukon and in the Yukon communities. I believe the count was 50 or 51. I know there were more informal ones, but there were just a great amount of conversations that have been had with Yukoners. I am looking forward to any continued discussion and debate here at Committee of the Whole on this piece of legislation.

I will just leave it there, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Cathers: In rising to speak to this today, I would just note for any Yukoners tuning in today that we have had quite a bit of discussion regarding this legislation and that the position that we have taken as the Yukon Party Official Opposition is that we recognize and respect that the issue of cannabis legalization is one that Yukoners have strong views on, both those in support of it and those opposed to it. Our position is that, since the federal government is committed to proceeding with legalization, we believe that it's the job of the Yukon government to prepare, to regulate and to manage that in a responsible manner.

We have brought forward both criticisms and suggestions on some elements of the government's approach. There is much within Bill No. 15 that has been done well, but we continue to have a difference of opinion with the government regarding how to handle both distribution and retail. Our position is that the approach outlined by the Province of Saskatchewan is a model that the Yukon should use most elements of, with some adjustments. That specifically would see a situation where government would not enter the retail of cannabis and would not enter the distribution of cannabis, but would leave both wholesale and retail to the private sector and would regulate it through a government entity.

With that summary, I would just note that unless the government has had a very recent change of heart, they have indicated that they are not willing to accept that suggestion and are committed to taking an approach that will grow the size of government and will also see the government spend an estimated \$2.7 million as their initial expenditure on purchasing cannabis inventory for the unnecessary government retail store.

I am going to move on to a specific question that originated from parents at one of our high schools, which included the fact that, with some of the new or more commonly available elements such as vapes and such, they have had some concerns that it appears that kids are already able to get their hands on what I believe is referred to as "shatter", which is a THC oil that is basically highly concentrated marijuana. I understand that it is already starting to be a problem and that there is some concern among parents

and school councils when marijuana becomes legal that if students think that because it is legal, it is something they can bring to school more brazenly, and that they can do so safely because it is legal.

What is the government going to be doing as far as providing schools and potentially school councils with resources to deal with a potential increase in the use of cannabis products by students? Whether that be in terms of — whatever form that assistance would be — whether it is increased resources for education or increased resources for schools to help ensure that it isn't happening on school grounds — I would appreciate if the minister could elaborate on that because it is a concern that I have heard from Yukon parents who are concerned that there may be a misplaced sense by some students that if government is legalizing it, then it is a totally safe product to consume. Of course, there are potential effects from the consumption of cannabis — especially over-consumption — that can be detrimental, especially to young citizens.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Mr. Chair, the challenge here is that we both want to get up to respond.

I thank the member opposite and we too acknowledge that there was a tremendous response from Yukoners on this topic. There remains a range of opinions just like all subjects; however, I will note that over 80 percent of Yukoners, when they responded to us, said that they were supporting the federal government's plan to legalize cannabis. Even though there is a range of views, there is also — it is worth acknowledging — a strong indication from Yukoners that we should be moving down this path.

Again, I thank the member opposite for his suggestions regarding not entering into the private sector at all. We agree that we need to control cannabis — “we” meaning the members opposite and ourselves here on this side. We disagree that we will be growing government unnecessarily. For the interim, we will enter into private retail to ensure that there will be access to cannabis sales until such a time as our good folks get the work done on regulations and licensing procedures. As I have said before, we will work diligently on that.

I thank the member opposite for relaying concerns that have been raised regarding high schools and parents. We share those concerns. I think it is worth acknowledging that cannabis already exists in our schools. I don't want to suggest that by legalizing it — the studies that we have seen have said that cannabis usage has not increased through a result of legalization.

We anticipate that it existed before and we anticipate it will exist going forward. We do believe that it is our responsibility to try to educate our youth and luckily we made that one of our two top priorities: to displace the illicit trade; and to focus on health and wellness — in particular, focus on our youth and educating our youth.

Yes, absolutely, we see the importance of educating our youth and that will happen in several ways. For example, the Department of Education and, of course, Health and Social

Services will have roles in it to educate. I think it's true that we all need to get some education and I recently was learning about shatter. What I want to say about shatter is that you can't vape it because it's a concentrate, and let's just acknowledge that it is illegal. As the federal legislation comes in, concentrates will remain illegal.

Will we have illegal drug use after this becomes legal here in the territory? I wish I could say we wouldn't, but I'm not naïve. I believe we will and I think it's our job to work together to try to do our best to displace that illegal trade. We will do that by opening a store, by making sure that the prices are reasonable, by working to educate the public alongside our parents, youth and everyone. We will do our best and I think that together we will be able to displace a lot of that illicit trade.

Mr. Cathers: I didn't really get the answer that I was hoping to receive and that parents were asking about. Perhaps the Minister of Justice and Minister of Education might be able to expand on it, since the Minister responsible for Yukon Liquor Corporation indicated that both of them had something to contribute to this debate.

I don't want to take a lot of the House's time this afternoon, but I do just want to flag that sincere and serious concern that I have heard from parents about how schools and school councils will be equipped to deal with this both in terms of educating students and dealing with, for lack of a better term, “policing” it on school grounds to ensure there isn't illegal consumption or consumption that is causing risk to others going on. If the minister could elaborate on that, that would be appreciated. If they're not able to provide the information at this point in time, I would just hope they would recognize that this concern I have heard from parents is both sincere and serious, and commit to getting back to us with more information at a later date if unable to respond today.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I'm not sure if the member opposite was present the other day when we spoke a little bit about this, but I certainly appreciate the opportunity and the question. We have already undertaken some youth engagement. I think that's an important piece of public education.

Let me back up just to say that what we know is that Yukon youth already use cannabis to an extent greater than many provinces and territories in Canada. Surveys over a number of years have provided us with that information. We have already begun to reach out to youth in our community to make sure that we are conveying information, education and concerns about health, the use of cannabis at a young age and any age — and that we convey that information to them in a serious way, but in a way in which they can receive it and in a way in which they will be open, if I can say that.

As a result, the Yukon began some engagement with youth back in September 2017. We have worked with BYTE to engage young people in Whitehorse and Dawson City and we will be visiting Teslin and Carmacks this month to talk to them about cannabis — to talk to them about it, but also to get from them how we can best reach youth with our messages about the seriousness of cannabis use at a young age and

about this new legislation, frankly and the fact, of course, that legalized cannabis is not legal for anyone under the age of 19 when the laws come into force and effect.

Legalization of cannabis was also a topic at the Millennial Town Hall forum last month here in Whitehorse that was attended by over 125 youth from across the territory. This was a great opportunity to receive advice on the educational approaches and communication methods most effective for young audiences, while broadening our understanding of what is known and not known about the effects of cannabis use.

This is an important opportunity for us to not only have the opportunity to dispel rumours, but we need to know what youth think about cannabis. We need to know, when they choose to use it, why they do. We need to know what they think about the effects and about the use/effect on their current health and their future health and we need to certainly understand and have conversations with them about the legalization of this substance and how that will be moving forward in our communities and in our society.

Of course, this piece of legislation, this bill, is written to ensure that cannabis is sold only to individuals over the age of 19. There will be precautions with respect to the structure of how cannabis will be available — of course, as my colleague has said, that doesn't mean that we will immediately dispel what is currently illegal use by youth here in the territory, but we hope to have an effect on that as we can, going forward.

The Government of Yukon is developing methods for how and when to check for identification and there will be very strict security, which is one of the benefits of us having a government retail store on a temporary basis because there literally will be one source for in-person purchases here in the territory, and an ability for us to determine how those security precautions and how those security measures will work best.

With respect to schools and school councils, we are always in support of our schools — listening to school councils and listening to school administration about how we can best help them deal with illicit substances in school and drug use by young people, and it is not simply cannabis, Mr. Chair.

We know and we have been very conscious of the partnerships between Education and the Department of Health and Social Services and other community groups — the chief medical officer of health — to make sure that we are in schools and talking to youth in a way in which they will respond about things like the dangers of fentanyl use or the dangers around the use of any drugs. Right now, in our society, we don't know where fentanyl shows up and youth are potentially in danger if they take anything when they are not aware of the contents.

That education has been ongoing. I expect that it will only be broadened when cannabis becomes legal because — and actually, it is happening now. We are not going to wait until the federal government's law is in force and effect because, as I noted earlier in this debate, there is already some federal public education happening. There are some television commercials, some posters and magazine ads — things like that are targeted at youth to say that this is a change, but these

are the effects on youth and it is not legal for youth. There is no question that this would be the case.

I am very keen to make sure that the schools, school councils and parents have the information they need to talk to their children and to have meaningful conversations with them about the use of any illicit substance. Of course, despite the fact that cannabis will be legalized for persons over the age of 19, it will be illicit for people under the age of 19. While we know that the laws will also be adjusted so that doesn't become a criminal matter, it will likely be a ticketable offence for youth and it is still an important distinction.

I take the point of the Member for Lake Laberge, but I also am mindful of the fact that we have not been wildly successful at dealing with the use of alcohol with our youth, for instance, and the dangers there. We know how serious and how important the effects of alcohol are on anyone, but certainly when someone starts to use it at a young age. So yes, we need to support our schools, absolutely — and our school councils and parents, absolutely. Do we need to get better at conveying that message? Yes, and as my colleague has said, educating ourselves as well to make sure that we can have meaningful conversations with our young people.

If my colleague, the Member for Lake Laberge, is looking for a yes-or-no answer, absolutely we will be supporting schools and school councils and listening to the administration. Most importantly, we will be listening to young people to say, "How do we reach you?" How do we convey this information and how can we best support them if there are problems with substance use or abuse?

Mr. Cathers: I could easily spend another afternoon debating this in general debate, but in the interest of time at the Legislative Assembly as we are nearing the end of the Spring Sitting, I will just take this opportunity to thank the officials who have been involved in this work, and I will conclude my remarks at general debate in the interest of moving into line-by-line debate.

Chair: Is there any further general debate?

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

On Clause 1

Ms. White: I just want to thank the ministers and their officials for the indulgence. We have talked about a lot of the questions that I had in line-by-line debate, I just want it as an opportunity for the ministers again to be able to explain the choice of language, although I definitely respect the reason why the drafters chose it. In this case, in part 1, "Purposes of Act", we use the language of "young persons", and line 1(b) says: "... protect young persons and discourage their access to, and consumption of, cannabis..." One of the things I wanted to know about is the choice of the language "young persons", and then I also want to know how we are going to discourage.

We have talked about public education and I have talked a lot about social responsibility — so if we could just get an overview of how the ministers expect section 1(b) and (c) to be enforced.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: To answer the first part of the question, the language "young persons" is to align with the

federal legislation. That is how the choice came about. The more we can be consistent, the stronger we believe the legislation is, in general. So that is why that language is chosen.

Because the Minister of Justice, who also happens to be the Minister of Education, just stood and talked for some time about how education is already beginning, and outreach and engagement with youth is already happening, I won't repeat all of that, but I will just say that we agree with the member opposite that it is important.

On the social responsibility side, we do have sort of a broad campaign. We acknowledge and agree that social responsibility is important. We want to prevent youth from accessing cannabis, and we recognize the importance of protecting public health. Part of that is the design of the whole system — how we ensure that, if a young person is coming in, we are making sure to ID those people so that we know that they are 19 or over. I just happened to have a meeting today with the chief medical officer for the Yukon. We were talking about social responsibility issues and how we do those.

It will likely be a suite of efforts that are coming forward. One of the things that I can talk about is that we acknowledge that we have a high usage for cannabis — one of the highest rates in the country — by our youth. It is not quite double, but it's 21 percent having used in the past year versus 12 percent nationally. That means that we have a lot of youth who are using, and we also know that, after alcohol, it is the next most highly used drug in the territory. We also know that there are differences between Whitehorse and our rural communities.

We have specific issues, and so when we design the social responsibility campaigns, it will be with that very specific notion. I will just echo the point by the minister that one of the ways we want to do it is by using tools that are not adult-centric but that are youth-centric — so the importance of making sure that we are working with groups that are youth-engaged, youth-driven and youth-led, because we believe that the effectiveness of those types of education efforts will just have way better reach, penetration and meaning for our youth.

I thought that the chief medical officer talked about this tension very well — that we know that young minds are still developing and that, if you could be really safe, you might set the age higher, but the problem with doing that is that you increase the black market for those young people. That's the tension that we're sort of working with. Displacing illicit trade is also part of the whole social responsibility piece that's out there.

One of the things I will say is that there will be, or there are in place already — but this is just going to be reinforced — strict penalties for anyone selling cannabis to youth. We'll go after that sort of thing, because we don't want it to be happening and we're worried about it. We recognize that youth will access cannabis and, to the point that the Member for Lake Laberge raised earlier, cannabis is not a static thing. The methods of delivery and usage are changing over time, and so we have to be alive to that difference and stay with our youth.

I will leave it there. If the member opposite is looking for more details, I can try to provide them.

Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2

Mr. Cathers: As part of our continuing effort as the Official Opposition to not just criticize the government but also provide them with alternatives and substantive constructive suggestions for taking an alternate approach, much as we did last fall with the *Public Airports Act* when we proposed constructive amendments that the government dismissed and ignored, I will propose an amendment to the *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, which would be a step toward going down a path where government does not get into the distribution of cannabis unnecessarily.

Amendment proposed

Mr. Cathers: I move:

THAT Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, be amended in clause 2(1) at page 2 by deleting the definition “distributor corporation”.

Chair: Order, please. We have reviewed the amendment. It is procedurally in order.

It has been moved by Mr. Cathers:

THAT Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, be amended in clause 2(1) at page 2 by deleting the definition “distributor corporation”.

Ms. White: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just waiting to see what else was going to happen. I fundamentally disagree with this motion. I have said it once, I have said it twice, and I have said it dozens of times: I fundamentally believe that the Yukon government should be the distributor corporation at all times. I don't believe it should be contracted out. I believe that is the responsibility of government, so I disagree with this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I thank the member opposite for the proposed amendment. I don't support it, but let me take a moment to try to describe why, because I think that is deserved.

First of all, if we were to drop it from the definitions — I don't know, because I haven't had a conversation with the member opposite, but then the next thing I would think is that the notion would be to drop it from throughout the act. I just took a quick count, and it is on 36 pages of this act. It is rather central to the act. In fact, it is the premise upon which the act is built — that there is a distributor corporation. The notion here is that, as a government, we will have control. As much as I appreciate the opinion of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King — the act is written in such a way to allow — at some later date, if we wish or a future government wishes — that the warehousing of cannabis could be done through the private sector. The challenge with that — and especially when you are starting out — is that you want to ensure that, as the system develops, there is a lot of care and control around this intoxicant. As it is introduced into our society in a legal fashion, we just want to be very thoughtful and careful that the

way in which it is introduced is done in a way that will be safe for the public. We don't have an intention to get there, but the act is written to allow it. So removing the "distributor corporation" doesn't enable what the member opposite is suggesting — the Member for Lake Laberge — because it is already enabled under this act.

I note, for example, that we have debated on the floor of this Legislature — and it has been held up as an example — that we should model ourselves after Saskatchewan. That is what was proposed by the Member for Lake Laberge. Again, Saskatchewan is one of 10 provinces and two other territories that are all doing it but, as far as I know, every one of them has a central corporation that is responsible, including Saskatchewan. I believe it is under the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority. They may allow for the warehousing and the distribution to be handled through the private sector. That is their stated intention. However, that doesn't mean that they don't ultimately have centralized control over cannabis in Saskatchewan.

I appreciate where the Member for Lake Laberge is interested in seeing us go — that is around getting to privatization quicker. I say again that we will be working diligently. I have had direction from colleagues on this side of the House, and the Premier has said it very aptly, that we want to get out of the business of doing business. We will be working in that direction. I am anticipating that will be shortly and then we will be able to see. I don't think it is achieved through the amendment, as proposed.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate that we and the NDP do have a philosophical difference on this matter. I appreciate the minister's perspective on it, but I do think the government continues to be mistaken in how they are approaching this. If it allays the minister's fear about the rest of the act, I would point out that we have to propose amendments to legislation clause-by-clause and sequentially, and we're not done this afternoon.

I would note that government — the Premier and the Minister responsible for the Yukon Liquor Corporation — has spoken about government wanting to get out of the business of doing business. Again, I just have to emphasize that step one, if you're serious about getting government out of the business of doing business, is to not expand into other areas, including the retail and distribution of cannabis.

I would just point out to the Minister responsible for the Yukon Liquor Corporation — he made reference to the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority — that at no time have we suggested an unregulated private sector. We're in support of effective regulation of the private sector but believe that a properly regulated private sector can handle the wholesale and retail of cannabis just as safely and just as responsibly as government.

It is my belief that most people in the Yukon, in both the public sector and the private sector, care deeply about their families and their communities, and that includes wanting to see things such as cannabis handled in a responsible manner that minimizes negative effects to communities and is not just

about companies or government looking at profit as their primary driver in this area.

Again, we're providing an alternative approach for government. If they are serious about not growing government, they can support this amendment. As I mentioned to the minister, his concerns about other sections of the act will be allayed during debate of subsequent clauses.

Chair: Is there any further debate on the amendment to the clause?

Are you prepared for the question?

Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: Disagreed.

Chair: I believe the nays have it.

Amendment to Clause 2 negatived

Ms. White: Section 2 has the definition of "intoxicated". I just wanted to know if that is the same definition as in the *Liquor Act*.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Essentially, the definitions are the same. They are not exactly the same. A small difference is that it will include here liquor and cannabis together. I note that we are intending to bring the *Liquor Act* forward this fall and we have started that engagement with the public now, and we will make sure those two things are aligned.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that answer. Again, I had excellent briefings multiple times from the officials. Sometimes I know the answer, to be honest — I often know the answer because we have gone through it, but it is just to give the opportunity to have that further conversation.

The next definition I would like is for "public place". I would like some examples of "public place" and I would also like to know how that would include things like edibles in the future.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: "Public place", as defined in section 2, means any place that the public may be able to access, including those places where youth are not able to access — for example, a bar or a club. The definition is important for the implementation of the rules for intoxication and possession because it is defined by a place. In this instance, it is almost identical to that in the *Liquor Act*.

Ms. White: Just looking toward the future — we know that edibles won't be made legal in the very near future but further down the road, and I just wanted to know how "public place" would affect something like edibles.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: There are provisions in the legislation for an eventual possibility way down the road for certain places that would otherwise be public places to be licensed for use — let's just say a café-type situation — but only in that instance. Otherwise, use is still prohibited in public places. That is a situation where regulation would need to be necessarily specific and there would need to be a licence provided that is specific to that.

I will just add that the intention here in this bill — and it is quite clear — is that licences will be very specific. They will be by application process, ultimately decided upon by a board tasked with that responsibility, but they have the

authority under this bill and ultimately this legislation to be very specific about licences — all kinds of details, not unlike the liquor licences at the moment, but quite possibly even more specific with respect to use, size, purpose, et cetera.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that answer. Another thing that I think is important and that we have talked about a lot is the idea of siting locations and such.

When we have the definition of “relevant considerations” in relation to an application for a licence, it “... means the following:...” So there are some pretty important clauses in this section that I would just like to give the ministers an opportunity to highlight again. These are just some of the consideration that we’ll be looking for when we talk about “relevant considerations” to the location of retail locations.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I appreciate the opportunity to answer this question, but also to comment on an extensive list of definitions in this bill and ultimately in this legislation. In my view, I have worked on this one extensively and I have currently been looking at another piece of proposed legislation or a draft bill coming forward with extensive definitions. In my view, they always provide more certainty to people. While certainly there have been pieces of legislation in the past in any jurisdiction in the world where definitions have been less than thorough, if I can say that, it always provides more certainty to people. While some people think three or four pages of definitions are not necessarily that useful, I would argue that, in fact, it does provide more certainty. Many, many times people might find themselves looking through a piece of legislation and say, “Oh, there’s a term; what does that mean?” I’m happy — while there is still work to be done on relevant considerations, clearly they are something that need to be dealt with by the board — that there is a reference here.

So a list of items used by the Cannabis Licensing Board is relevant — so the “relevant considerations” — that section says: “... in relation to an application for a licence, means the following:...” — and then there are a number of items listed. The perhaps plain-language version of that is that the list of items used by the Cannabis Licensing Board when considering private licence applications is the relevant considerations. While the listed considerations are all relevant, the board is not limited to considering those. The approach to relevant considerations is based on the federal *Cannabis Act* as well as the Yukon *Liquor Act*. We’re using what we know from those other pieces of legislation to inform this decision.

Relevant considerations received support by the member opposite’s party during the opposition briefings and that’s an important opportunity for us to get feedback. They will provide the board with the ability to consider density and community composition. They will also be able to consider — well, let me maybe finish by saying it will also provide the board with the ability to consider population dynamics and how those dynamics may change with a season or geographically — something like Dawson City, as an example, where there are lots of summer residents and those kinds of things.

It will also provide the board with the ability to consider economic benefits that may occur as a result of a retail store,

for example — employment at retail stores or at a retail business. It also provides the public and local governments with an ability to provide their views to the Cannabis Licensing Board on the proposed business and/or its proposed operation plan and how it may impact the community.

This section goes on for some time, so there is a list of relevant considerations. It will allow the Cannabis Licensing Board to consider the capital investment that a licensee is proposing to make. It allows the board to consider whether the premises proposed for the sale is suitable. Does it have enough appropriate security? Is it of an appropriate professional standard? Does it comply with the environmental health requirements? Also, relevant considerations will allow the Cannabis Licensing Board to consider whether the licensee has been convicted of a violent crime in the past or convicted of fraud or has an association with organized crime.

It will also ensure that the licensee is obtaining a licence for premises that they have a right through ownership — or contractually a right — to use for the purposes of selling cannabis or committing consumption. I will continue, just to make sure that all of the details are here, but it is clearly an opportunity for all aspects of a licensee’s application to be considered — about them personally, about their business and about their plan for the sale of cannabis or entering into that business. It will avoid the risk of having non-compliant licences issued or poorly developed business plans reviewed, because there is an opportunity for the corporation and the president of the corporation to assist with that so that applications are not being rejected for inappropriate reasons, but that maybe need to be fleshed out a bit more or have more detail.

This section will also allow the Cannabis Licensing Board to consider whether a licence applicant has been sanctioned under other cannabis or liquor licensing regimes. Consideration is not limited to the Yukon. They can look at other jurisdictions as well. It will allow for the Cannabis Licensing Board to review the operational plan provided by the applicant to ensure items, such as ongoing security, have been appropriately considered — their staff complement, the history of individuals who might work there. It allows Cabinet to make regulations to require the board to consider other matters — for example, local considerations like something that might be critical, for instance, in a local situation, whether in Pelly Crossing or Teslin.

Relevant considerations are based, in part, on section 37 of the *Liquor Act* because in that situation the Liquor Board considering a licensee application can make many of those inquiries as well. We wanted to be as specific and critical as possible in allowing this section to be fulsome so that examples of what can be considered are clear to the board coming forward. It also is appropriately in line with the federal requirements for additional safeguards. Lastly, I should note that as the situation evolves, more specifics could be considered. It is not an exhaustive list. It certainly is a long and important one, but the board would be able to consider other relevant considerations prescribed by regulation if

something comes to light. That would be appropriate. I think that answers that.

Ms. White: I do appreciate how the minister started off by saying this is going to be the non-legal version and then she reverted back to being a lawyer and it became quite legal there, but I appreciate it because there was the attempt.

I just wanted confirmation from the Minister of the Yukon Liquor Corporation because we had this conversation — and I'm not sure if we had it in the Chamber, or if I had it in the briefing — but it comes under "relevant considerations" section (e). It says: "(e) the amount of the actual or projected capital expenditure made or to be made by the applicant in relation to the premises".

I originally asked if that was similar to the Liquor Corporation and I believe that the answer is yes, but I'm just looking for confirmation — so to understand that a retailer of cannabis will not be treated in a different way than a retailer of liquor.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: The answer to the question is yes, it is the same under liquor. I will just add a couple of small points that are not directly related to this, but just worth putting out there. When we think about relevant considerations, of course, there are other jurisdictions that may have interests in this and I acknowledge, also as Minister of Community Services, that our municipalities have the right and authority to zone within their municipality. So I just acknowledge that is theirs.

One second, Mr. Chair. Yes, it is under liquor licences, section 37(e).

One last point I will make — I thought it through as the Minister of Justice was speaking. If we are going to control cannabis, as we are proposing here, and we want to get to the private retail model or, someday, private warehousing model, that's fine. Then we would have, for example — let's say that a licensee wanted to step forward and propose that they wish to have a retail licence. Then that would turn to a licensing board, as the minister suggested. Where will that licensing board reside? It would be under a corporation. That is why we need this distributor corporation and so, from my perspective, it just emphasizes the point for me that regardless of whether you are going with the private model or the public model, you still need the distributor corporation.

Ms. White: Like the minister said, there are a lot of definitions in this section, which I appreciate. I was wondering if one of the ministers now could talk about remote sale and the definition of "remote sale" please.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: "Remote sale" basically means online sales or mail order, if you like, commonly referred to as e-commerce.

I won't talk a lot about it, but that is the notion — that right now when cannabis is first legalized, the territory is a big place and we are not going to be able and don't wish to open retail stores everywhere. While we do want to open one, we recognize that it is important to have e-commerce in place to displace the illicit market. We know from our engagement results that a lot of Yukoners wanted the ability to have this.

The remote sale will be authorized by the government corporation or it is possible that they could also be provided for through regulations. It allowed for that enabling factor, although for now it will just start through this act itself. The details of how that e-commerce would work will come out through regulation; for example, that would be around how delivery will happen, how we ensure that the person who is receiving it is of age and is the person who placed the order, et cetera. This is one of those things where we track from seed to sale and we need to make sure that on the e-commerce side it works as well.

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Ms. White: Dwelling-house — this is a definition when we look at the beginning — we had conversations about how if, for example, someone was living in a campground for the summer that "dwelling-house" could then mean their campsite and their tent. If I could please just get some elaboration on the definition of "dwelling-house", it would be fantastic.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I will answer this question by making some reference to the public engagement because this is how this work came about: 58 percent of respondents to the public survey agree that there should be limitations on public consumption of all forms of cannabis — smoking, eating, mixing in other edibles, et cetera; 77 percent of respondents to the public survey agree that people should be allowed to smoke cannabis on private property; 57 percent said there should be some restrictions — like tobacco — for smoking cannabis in public, which, of course, is the case here; and 73 percent of respondents to the public survey agree that we will likely need special rules governing the consumption of cannabis in multi-unit dwellings. I think we have talked about that in the earlier part of the general debate, so those are buildings where there will be a mixture of public and private spaces.

"Dwelling-house" means a residence that is occupied either permanently or temporarily and — as the Member for Takhini-King noted — includes a tent, a mobile home, a recreational vehicle or trailer, et cetera. It includes a private guest room in a hotel, a motel or a bed and breakfast that has been designated as a place where consumption is permitted by the owner or management. A dwelling-house also includes the land surrounding a residence — for example, a yard or garden — as well as other buildings on the property, like a garage or a shed or a greenhouse. It goes on in subsection (3), for greater clarity, to indicate what is not part of a dwelling-house.

That subsection (3)(a) makes reference, indicating that the following are not part of a dwelling-house: a tent, mobile home, recreational vehicle or trailer, et cetera, if it is located on recreational land and the administrator of the land has prohibited consumption or cultivation in writing and takes steps to inform users of the same.

We spoke earlier in this debate about how, in certain circumstances, the owner of a property — the owner of a private campground, for instance, can restrict use of cannabis on their own property. It does not include a tent, a mobile

home, a recreational vehicle or trailer, et cetera, that is located on Commissioner's land that is not recreational land. It doesn't include a common area in a hotel — so to be clear, a dwelling-house does not include a common area in a hotel or motel or bed and breakfast, a multi-dwelling unit or a building with commercial space; it does not include a rental unit where there is a legally enforceable agreement. It does not include a condominium where there is a bylaw restricting consumption or cultivation. We spoke again the other day about that, about how a condominium corporation or the owner of a multi-unit facility could restrict use.

Subsection (4) under dwelling-house means that smoking and/or vaping of cannabis will not be allowed where smoking of tobacco is currently prohibited through an agreement between a landlord and a tenant. It also means that smoking and/or vaping of cannabis will not be allowed where smoking of tobacco is currently prohibited through bylaws of a condominium corporation, and when considering rules for a dwelling-house — the reference to a document — again, the bottom part of that section means a contract between the owner and occupant of a tenancy agreement or of a hotel or other temporary type residence.

Recreational land — it goes on with that definition. One of the interesting parts of — I'm sure this is evident to the member opposite, but one of the interesting parts about defining "dwelling-house" in this circumstance is that, for greatest clarity, we tried to include the definition of "dwelling-house" and then what it is not, so that there would be greater certainty. It is a drafting method that is somewhat helpful, but it's particularly helpful in this situation with legislation dealing with a new substance. The regulation of cannabis is new in Canada, and we're trying to give as much certainty for people as possible.

The definition of "dwelling-house" is based, in part, on a definition from the federal legislation and the definition of "residence" in the *Liquor Act* here in the territory.

Ms. White: We have discussed at length under dwelling-house (3)(d) and (e) — it talks about a rental unit within the meaning of *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* or a room. To understand then, would (d) cover things like mobile homes that are privately owned on rented land?

There was a conversation about this, so I am just going to look for that same clarity. In subsection (3)(e), it talks about condominiums. We have talked about the differences between condominiums that have shared space — doors that exit into a shared hallway and shared air — and then we have talked about the differences between condominiums that are individual buildings on shared property. Can the minister talk about those two examples? For example, in a mobile home park, if it was to be decided that people within their own homes could not smoke cannabis, is that something that, if it was challenged, it would be enforceable?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Because we have spoken about this previously, I will answer it relatively succinctly but, if there are more explanations needed, I am happy to do so.

With respect to condominiums, clearly the use of a condominium in whatever form it might exist — a building

with a common space is obviously more specific than perhaps a townhouse style or a style where there are individual homes — but the condominium corporation will be the authority to regulate the use of cannabis in those condominiums, particularly the way in which they are the authority and probably regulate things like consumption of cigarettes — or smoking — as well. It will be up to the condominium corporation to deal with the individual owners in a condominium situation.

While I appreciate that we had some discussion earlier about the distinction between the stand-alone homes and more apartment-style condos, the authority will still rest with the condominium corporation because, in one's stand-alone condominium, the quiet use and enjoyment of their backyard next to a very closely situated backyard might be an issue. The condominium corporation will have the authority there.

With respect to rental situations, obviously the landlord — if you are not an owner, the landlord has the authority to regulate the use of that property as well, including the use of cannabis. We clarified the other day, and I am happy to clarify again, that as the owner of a mobile home, there is nothing in the *Residential Landlord and Tenant Act* that defines the pad owner as distinct from the owner of the mobile home in relation to cannabis. There is nothing in this piece of legislation — let me say it more clearly that way — that deals with those definitions. A person who owns their own mobile home, so long as they are not interfering with the quiet use and enjoyment of the other neighbours, can conduct themselves accordingly in their own property. In the event that somebody who owned a mobile home pad was trying to require them to do certain things or not do certain things in their own residence, the enforceability of such a thing would certainly be questionable.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that.

Just using that last example then, the difference between a condominium and a mobile home and the ability to have the quiet enjoyment inside your unit if it wasn't, for example, in the back yard and houses that were close together — if she could just elaborate on that please.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I appreciate the distinction. Obviously, if you are not interfering with the use of your neighbour's property or your fellow condo owner's property in a stand-alone unit, or even quite possibly in an apartment-style unit, the enforceability with respect to breaking condominium corporation rules would be pursuant to the condominium corporation. Individuals can, for the most part — so long as they are not interfering with their neighbours — conduct themselves appropriately in their own residences.

Mr. Cathers: I am just going to ask a question that — in the answer we got earlier, it appeared to be that government had not yet decided what the rules will be in government-run campgrounds, but considering government just this week made an announcement of a rule change for campgrounds that would provide a \$200 fine if someone left a campsite unattended for over 24 hours, it appears that Cabinet may have revisited the rules regarding campsites.

So I would just ask whichever minister wants to respond: Has the government made a decision yet about what the rules will be in government-run campgrounds? Will someone be able to smoke cannabis or will they not be allowed to smoke cannabis?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: We have not taken that decision. Part of that, as we go forward with regulations, we will be engaging with the public again, and this is one of those things that will come forward as we do that engagement.

The other issue, which was talking about not holding campsites by parking your vehicle and walking away — we had done a lot of engagement on and that came forward very specifically. So even though they are both in government campsites, the discussion with the public is at different phases.

Chair: Is there any further debate on clause 3?

Mr. Cathers: It is unfortunate that we're not getting clarity on that. I would again just note to the minister — in the interest of time, I am not going to spend much time on this clause this afternoon — but government does need to make a decision about which path they are taking in this area. If they are going to do consultation, which I believe I heard the minister say, then certainly we would welcome them holding public consultations on this. This is an important question because, in the absence of clear rules around whether someone can or cannot smoke cannabis at a government-owned campsite, there is guaranteed to be some conflict between campers, I would suggest, on the very day that it is legalized or quite soon thereafter.

I look forward to public consultations if that is the path the government is going down.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I do thank the member opposite and we have taken note of his question and concern. I think it is a great question; I appreciate it.

We have had a lot of engagement on cannabis; we will continue to have a lot of engagement. It is not that we are going to go out and have just one specific engagement on one question. It is ongoing with lots of engagement, so I appreciate his suggestion that we get clarity on this when cannabis becomes legalized. Again, I thank him for his suggestion.

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Ms. White: Clause 4 talks about the review of the act, and in 4(1) it says at least once every five years, which I totally appreciate. I would say at this point in time that Yukon government — no matter which Yukon government it has been — has had a problem in reviewing acts within the time frame. I am just going to put that out there. I appreciate that it says once at least every five years. I understand that it is new legislation and it will probably change rapidly in the future, but Yukon government as a whole — we have had a hard time meeting our requirements. I just wanted to put that out there.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Just as I answered to the last response, I want to thank the member opposite. It is a fair concern that is raised and we appreciate it. We will just do our best. One of things that I will acknowledge is that we wrote in the word “must” here; we didn't make it a “can”. We made it

a “must”. We appreciate that — especially given, as the member opposite notes, this is new legislation and, as I have noted, this field is changing, so there will be a need to look at the performance of the act and make sure that we adjust it over time so that it stays current.

Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Mr. Cathers: In rising to debate clause 5, I would note that clause is the first one in part 2 that speaks to the creation of a distributor corporation. It specifically notes — clause 5(1): “There is established a distributor corporation for the purposes of this Act...”, et cetera. I would note that, in debate on an earlier clause, the Minister responsible for the Yukon Liquor Corporation suggested that there needed to be a distributor corporation to provide for the licensing and management of private sector retail and the potential private sector wholesale that the government is now indicating that it may consider — I would just note, without jumping too far ahead to other lines, but since it is very relevant to clause 5 — I would point out to the minister that part 3 of the act speaks to the licensing board.

Part 4 of the act speaks to licences and classes of licences as well as their application, issuance and renewal. If you jump ahead a little bit in the act to the next part of that, there is a variation of relinquishment of licences, sanctions on licensees and so on — all contained within other sections of the act that don't pertain to the creation of a distributor corporation. Looking through this act, it seems to us, again, that the creation of a distributor corporation is entirely unnecessary. The creation of licensing provisions is done by other sections of the act.

Again, in those sections of the act, I would note that we think, generally speaking, the government, officials and legislative drafters have done a good job of setting up most of those provisions. However, we continue to believe that government getting into the retail and wholesaling of cannabis is completely unnecessary and that the approach outlined within the Province of Saskatchewan is a model that, generally speaking, can be imported into the Yukon.

I won't reiterate the points and examples that I gave in previous debates of how the Yukon could do it under our own territorial legislative structure. I will simply note again that we have laid on record on numerous occasions the reasons as to why the creation of a distributor corporation is, in our view, entirely unnecessary and how government can avoid getting into the retail and distribution of cannabis.

Accordingly, after reviewing the act, we believe that we can offer another constructive suggestion. Therefore, I propose the following amendment.

Amendment proposed

Mr. Cathers: I move:

THAT Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, be amended by deleting Part 2, Distributor Corporation, at pages 12 to 21 and renumbering the remaining clauses and parts accordingly.

Chair: The amendment is in order. It has been moved by Mr. Cathers:

THAT Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, be amended by deleting Part 2, Distributor Corporation, at pages 12 to 21 and renumbering the remaining clauses and parts accordingly.

Mr. Cathers: I am not going to spend too much time in speaking to this. I would just again recap the fact that, as part of trying to provide the government with constructive alternatives where they have gone down the wrong path — that is what we are doing in bringing forward this proposed amendment. As I mentioned, the other sections of the act do speak to and lay out the structure for allowing government to issue licences to retailers once the government allows them to apply for private retail licences. If the government feels that some additional consequential amendments are necessary to specifically speak to wholesale, then, of course, we would be happy to entertain suggestions in that area as well. Based on the statements by the Minister responsible for the Liquor Corporation, his indication is that this is not necessary. It appears that other sections of the act do provide for that retail to occur.

With that, having gone through it very carefully — we have looked at the sections of this legislation and it is our view that the entirety of part 2 of the *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act* can be deleted and government can then, rather than entering the retail and distribution of cannabis, take a path similar to that being taken in Saskatchewan where government regulates and issues licences for both the wholesale and retail of cannabis but does not spend taxpayers' dollars on buying cannabis, does not take business risks with taxpayers' dollars and does not enter into an area where government arguably has a conflict of interest and objectives in, on the one hand, trying to sell cannabis and to make money from it while, on the other hand, trying to regulate it and prevent its over-sale.

With that, Mr. Chair, I will wrap up my comments on this amendment and hope — but doubt — that the government will choose to take this constructive suggestion and improve the legislation as this amendment would do.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Hope springs eternal, Mr. Chair. I respect that the member opposite is proposing to amend the legislation. Dropping, not just sections or clauses, but whole parts of the act on the fly is not really my way of thinking how we should legislate.

I would just like to say that the public servants who have been working on this act have been doing a tremendous amount of work and that tremendous amount of work isn't just, "Well, let's just cut out a section." I will give one simple example. Later on, in the section that the member opposite feels is okay with licensees, for example, under section 25(5)(a) that the licensee can sell only cannabis purchased from a distributor corporation — okay, well we better get that fixed too — subsequent amendment — or later on in clause 53(2)(b)(ii) that they're prohibited from the sale unless it is

purchased through a distributor corporation. It's not so simple as to cut a section out.

What I have been trying to say is that, while we appreciate that there is a perspective that is being raised here, I don't agree that the suggested amendment will achieve what is being asked. In fact, I have stated and will state one last time — maybe not one last time; careful there — I will state again that it is our belief that we need a distributor corporation even when we have private retail in place, because we then have the regulations in place and the licensing procedure in place and government has stepped out of it and we still require the distributor corporation.

I appreciate, in principle, what the member opposite is trying to achieve, but it is not achieving it from our perspective, and I'm saying that out of respect for all of those public servants who spent a long time doing careful drafting work. It's not just so simple as to drop, I believe it is, 10 pages from the act.

Ms. White: I think, first of all, I don't believe the amendment has anything to do with the drafters. I think this is a value-based thing and, as the Member for Lake Laberge stated before, my values happen to differ from his not only on this point but probably a million other ones.

I fundamentally believe that the distribution of cannabis is the responsibility of the Government of Yukon, no different from how I believe that the Government of Yukon is responsible for the delivery of health care, that I believe that they're responsible for the delivery of justice and many, many other things. I don't think that the amendment was meant to target the drafters, but I really do fundamentally believe that, when we talk about distribution, it is the role and responsibility of government.

I said it early on in the definitions, I said it throughout the debate, I said it during the briefings, I have said it publicly and I will say it again: distribution, in my opinion, is a fundamental responsibility of government, and I do not agree with the proposed amendment.

Mr. Cathers: I do respect the position of the Member for Takhini-Kopper King and, as we have both alluded to, we do see things differently in this area, but I do respect her position on this, even though I disagree with it.

Again, I just want to reiterate the fact, as I did earlier, that my view — and I think it's fair to say that my colleagues in the Official Opposition share that view — is that most Yukoners, whether they work in the public sector or the private sector, care about this territory. They care about their families. They care about their community, and it is my view that a responsibly regulated private sector in the area of the retail and distribution of cannabis can do so just as safely and just as responsibly as the public sector would in that area. Again, I want to reiterate that it needs to be properly regulated to ensure that — there is always the potential for people who do not fall into that general category of having the best interests of the community and the territory at heart.

In this area, I just want to specifically note, in response to the Minister responsible for the Liquor Corporation's comments here, that I was not in any way, shape or form

trying to reflect negatively on the work by officials. As the minister knows very well, the drafting of any legislation is done based on instructions from Cabinet. I don't know whether the current Liberal government has made changes to the way that legislation was reviewed in the past and has potentially taken an approach that results in less diligence and attention to detail by ministers and Cabinet and caucus, but, in the past, during our time in government, we had line-by-line review of legislation by the Cabinet Committee on Legislation before it was tabled. It was an opportunity for the elected representatives of Yukoners, who were members of the government caucus, to engage with officials on those specific details.

During that time, there were many, many changes and adjustments made during discussion at the Cabinet Committee on Legislation and, of course, at an earlier drafting stage in what we refer to as LOC, the Legislative Overview Committee. So, ultimately, Cabinet has made the decisions on the content of this legislation and we believe that, while much of it is good and we give credit to officials for their work in those areas, as well as the information provided in the briefing, ultimately the policy decisions contained with this legislation, including whether to go with retail or not and the details of each and every clause, the final decision is made by Cabinet on what that content should be.

Contrary to the minister's assertion that we are proposing amendments on the fly, we have gone through the legislation. I have gone through it. Colleagues have gone through it. We have attended the briefings provided by officials. We have given consideration to those clauses and, as a result of the time that those of us who were previously in government have spent as part of Cabinet and the Cabinet Committee on Legislation, we also have some familiarity of legislative structure and, in proposing changes, gave very thoughtful consideration to what changes should be proposed, as well as checking with experts to ensure that the changes we were proposing were in order and would meet the requirements of the Legislative Assembly.

So it's certainly not a case of proposing amendments on the fly. The minister was correct in making reference to section 25 of the act and noting that it references the distributor corporation. I would point out to the minister that I referred to that part and others within the act that pertain to the issuing of retail licences as generally being ones that I supported, but there are some specific changes that we would propose. If this amendment to remove the distributor corporation part of the act is to pass, then I would be happy to propose subsequent amendments to the parts that reference the distributor corporation.

While the minister might see it as being on the fly, I can assure him that it is the opposite of that. We've given very careful review to this and the amendments, as noted by the Chair in ruling on this, are procedurally in order. We are trying to do our job as the Official Opposition in outlining alternative approaches to the government when we believe they're going down the wrong path, including proposing

substantive amendments that would correct what we see as flaws in the legislation.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: First of all, I want to take a moment to clarify that in no way was my colleague suggesting — and hopefully no one took offence — that, in some way, the Member for Lake Laberge was insulting or being concerned about the work that the drafters had done. That wasn't anybody's intention. He was simply taking an opportunity to express how much work had gone into this.

Amendments are certainly appropriate at this stage of the debate. Of course, it's the role of the Legislative Assembly — there are several examples where amendments were suggested by the opposition and actually made small amendments to pieces of legislation that had already been on the floor of this House and which ultimately became law. But I would suggest, Mr. Chair, that redrafting a complicated piece of legislation that has been widely consulted on, to the extent that is being suggested here, is simply not appropriate.

I want to confirm that the wide consultation with respect to this piece of legislation took place, as we all know, over many months. But let me remind us all — and certainly for those Yukoners who are listening — that a public survey took place in August and September of 2017. Over 3,100 people responded to that survey. That survey contemplated a distributor corporation. So let's be clear about that: that survey contemplated a distributor corporation. At no point had we heard from the opposition that was of concern to them.

The framework, which was distributed publicly in November and December of 2017, also contemplated a distributor corporation because, Mr. Chair, the structure of the governance model that is being used for this piece of legislation and for the regulation and control of cannabis in the Yukon Territory is one in which a distributor corporation plays a key role — plays the key role.

I note here that the key role — or certainly the concept — of a distributor corporation has been something that was publicly known and publicly engaged on as early as August 2017.

After the framework, after the survey and after the public announcement and consultation on the framework, there was a summary of the legislation. The summary of the legislation was distributed and feedback was collected in January and February 2018. It also contemplated a distributor corporation.

There were some 50 meetings across the territory with First Nation governments, with municipalities, with industry, with individuals, with community groups — with anyone who was interested. A team of individuals working on this legislation, and ultimately this bill, met over 50 times with our communities and individuals across the territory. Always in those conversations — the concept of the governance model that is here in this bill today, including the core key role of a distributor corporation, was available to them and was part of the conversation.

I don't think I will take too much time to make reference to the comments about how this process occurs, not because it's not an important one, but there is a Cabinet committee on legislation, which I chair. There have been extensive meetings

of that group with respect to policy decisions, the concepts of structure — frankly, some of the conversations were what word would be included, down to a “may” or a “shall”, as is often in legislative drafting.

In addition to that, there was a ministerial working group at which, on a regular basis, at least six ministers of this government participated. These decisions were regularly discussed at all of those meetings. I won't make reference to any Cabinet meetings but, understanding our one-government approach, you'll know that this has been a project that has been worked on since before August 2017, but particularly and specifically since August 2017, going forward on a regular basis to make the determinations, to make the decisions that are here today and to design the structure of governance for this piece of legislation. All along, the public was fully aware that a distributor corporation was the concept.

The Official Opposition was fully aware that a distributor corporation was the concept. It really has only been during this debate that we have heard that was of concern to them. That's fine; that's their prerogative, but changing the concept — the core governance model — of the way in which we will regulate cannabis in this territory is simply not something we can support through this amendment.

Mr. Cathers: I have to just note, in beginning to speak to this, that I'm not sure whether the minister has been hiding under a rock and not listening to the statements that we have made on this, but —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Chair: Hon. Ms. McPhee, on a point of order.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I am more than willing to listen to what the Member for Lake Laberge has to say on any topic, but I would appreciate the personal insults ending.

Chair: On the point of order, Mr. Cathers.

Mr. Cathers: I used a common figure of speech. It was not intended to be insulting to the minister personally.

Chair's ruling

Chair: I would have to disagree. It is not a common figure of speech. Accusing someone of hiding under a rock has some derogatory connotations to it. I would ask the member to refrain from using that phrase.

Mr. Cathers: What I have to point out here is — I am not sure whether the government has not been paying attention to public statements made by the Official Opposition on this. We have been quite clear during this process that we were looking for whether government was supporting the private sector in this. We have been clear about the fact, on numerous occasions, that we did not support the growth of government into retail and distribution, and it is a little rich to hear the Minister of Justice suggesting otherwise here this afternoon.

What we do have to point out to the minister and to her colleagues is that we have also spent a fair bit of time dealing with legislation. We have come forward with constructive and

specific suggestions that are hardly “on the fly”, as the minister likes to characterize them. To effectively say — as the Minister of Justice appeared to be saying earlier — that this was far too complex for anyone else to propose amendments to — the legislation itself is, of course, very detailed. Like any legislation of this type, there are some complexities, but overall, it is not an overly complex bill that cannot be amended.

We are clearly not going to get anywhere with the government in here but I do have to point out for any Yukoners who are listening to or reading this that the assertions being made by the government about the myriad of reasons why they can't change the path that they have decided incorrectly to go down, in our view, which grows the size of government and sees government expand into retail and distribution of cannabis and buying cannabis unnecessarily at the expense of some \$2.7 million for the initial buy, according to the government's own figures.

We are providing specific, constructive suggestions for an alternate approach, including specific, constructive amendments to the legislation. The government has chosen, in its infinite wisdom, that the Liberal government is not going to take constructive suggestions from the Official Opposition. That is their choice.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I do respect that the members opposite have brought forward amendments, but I will tell you, Mr. Chair, that we thought it possible that amendments might be coming. We thought that they would deal with not growing government and with supporting the private sector, yet we did not anticipate that the suggestion, through an amendment, would be to drop 10 pages of this legislation here today on the floor. No, we didn't see that coming. I happen to sit right above — my office is very close. I have said before and I will say again: By all means, bring forward those suggestions to me anytime. It doesn't have to be on the floor here today.

I respect that it is the right of the members opposite. I don't see this as an amendment on the fly — far from it — but I don't see it as being friendly. The member had ample opportunity to come forward.

What I have been trying to say is that, while I recognize that they are thoughtful about this, the legislation isn't so simple as to cut 10 pages and think that it is going to behave in the same way, or behave in the way that the member opposite is proposing. That is the point that I am trying to make. If we want responsibly regulated cannabis in the territory, as the member opposite suggests — and as we concur and, in fact, as I think the Third Party agrees as well — where do they want it responsibly regulated? To whom? Who will be that regulator? Because it is not a distributor corporation — that's their position? Then, who? Is it me as the minister — who? What I tried to say as I stood here is that, in order to have a responsibly regulated cannabis industry here in the territory once it becomes legal, it is our belief that we should use a distributor corporation that in no way grows government and that in no way does not support the private sector. In fact, it is the opposite.

Mr. Chair, that is why we don't support the amendment because it doesn't achieve responsibly regulated industry.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate the minister's comments. I would note that I didn't refer to this as a friendly amendment. I referred to it as a constructive amendment. We were not trying to be unfriendly in proposing it, but the fact of this is that the minister is simply mistaken in his statement in indicating that there has to be distributor corporation. If government has a regulation body, including the licensing board provided for in a different part of this act, government is completely able to set the structure where they allow for the issuance of licences for both wholesale and retail to Yukon businesses that have successfully completed the application process. It is simply not correct to say that government has to set up a distributor corporation, and this part of the act, in going through it — part 2 — is, in fact, an entire section that can be removed without requiring more than a few minor amendments to other sections of the act.

The minister suggested that we should have shared our amendment at an earlier date. I could make the same remark about the government's legislation. They didn't provide the legislation to us before tabling it here in the House. They brought it forward — in keeping with typical conventions — and made the legislation public when they tabled it in the House. We have followed the same typical conventions here in the Legislative Assembly by providing the government with our proposed amendments when the legislation came up for debate.

From a policy standpoint, in terms of signalling where we felt government should go, I certainly feel that I have been clear in previous debates here in the House about the fact that we do not think the government needs to get into the retail or distribution of cannabis. Going back several months, we have indicated what our priorities were in terms of our view of the public interest in terms of not growing government and providing opportunity for the private sector instead of having government get further into the business of doing business.

I should just note as well to ministers that it's important to remind them and anyone reading or listening that while government did do consultation on questions related to the policy framework of cannabis legalization and did have subsequent discussions with the public on their draft legislative framework — I forget the proper title of that document — the legislation itself did not actually go out for public consultation.

Clearly, we're not going to get anywhere with the government this afternoon on this issue. They have clearly decided what path they're going down and are focused on providing a list of reasons or, I would say in my view, simply excuses of why they won't take the constructive suggestions and proposals coming forward from the Official Opposition, but I do note we have and will continue to try to be constructive in bringing forward amendments. That's what we're doing here today and the amendments that we have proposed followed a very careful and diligent review of the act, discussions with officials at the briefings about what any sections we had questions about did and following consulting

with experts to ensure that the legislation proposed was in order.

With that, unless there are other comments that I need to respond to from the other side, I would suggest that we could probably proceed to a vote on this proposed amendment. It is unfortunate that the government is choosing to stay down the path that they have chosen rather than taking a path that would reduce the cost to taxpayers and see the Yukon not grow the size of government unnecessarily and would ensure that the risks and costs are borne by the private sector, not by Yukon government using taxpayers' dollars.

Chair: Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Count.

Count

Chair: A count has been called.

Bells

Chair: All those in favour of the amendment please rise.

Members rise

Chair: All those opposed please rise.

Members rise

Chair: The results are five yea, 11 nay.

Amendment to Clause 5 negatived

Chair: Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is continuing clause-by-clause debate on Bill No. 15.

Is there any further debate on clause 5?

Ms. White: Mr. Chair, I am just going to put out there that I fundamentally believe that the government has the role and responsibility to be the distributor corporation. If we look at, for example, the earnings of the territory — first of all, it is income tax and second of all, it is the Liquor Corporation, so there is also a financial benefit for it.

I know in discussions, the Minister responsible for the Liquor Corporation has talked about in the future how it could be contracted out. Again, I am just going to put on the record that I fundamentally believe that distribution is the responsibility of Yukon government — especially when we look at the earnings of the Liquor Corporation as a comparison; there is financial sense for that. I just wanted to make sure we had that conversation right here under "Distribution Corporation".

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Clause 7 agreed to

On Clause 8

Ms. White: In clause 8, it talks about the measures for responsible consumption and it talks about the responsibilities of the distributor corporation. Again, this goes back to social responsibility. It talks about an (a) and (b) — so (a) is to facilitate only responsible consumption of cannabis, while not promoting the consumption of cannabis, and (b) is to enhance public awareness of the health risks associated with cannabis use. I know we have talked about this at great length, so maybe we could have a short little bit about the how and the who and why of it. Then I will be happy to move on.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Just to respond to the earlier comment by the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, regardless of whether or not there is a private warehouse — for example, right now, liquor is shipped to the territory by private companies. We anticipate cannabis being done the same. The responsibility will lie with us as a government for the control and the revenue, for that matter. Even if you privatize the side of it where you say it is going to go — if you get licensees, for example, to sell it, the control will still be through the government and, therefore, there will be revenue.

I also just want to comment that, when I look at the revenue that is generated, for example, from alcohol in the territory, it doesn't come close to the costs that we incur through the over-consumption of alcohol — not the general consumption, but when it is misused or when there are addictions. There are so many issues, and it has never made sense to me that we should try to earn money through the sale of alcohol, if there are still problems with that. We always must be balancing that. Social responsibility is a real issue.

We have a mandate. The interim retail store will have a focus on education — I have stated that here. It is not just about concerns around cannabis, but it is about responsible consumption. We have talked about youth and how we plan to engage them through youth-centred education. I know that the Minister of Health and Social Services is working on it. Her department will have the lead on education. We can put things through our e-commerce site. We will use all of the avenues that we have to provide information for the public, including both to try to reduce the illicit market and to make sure that the public is aware — I think it was the Member for Lake Laberge who talked about this being a learning experience for the whole of the territory. The notion will be that we want to have a focus on getting that information out through all of the channels that we have open to us, and we will have a particular focus on youth.

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 9 through 13 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 9 through 13 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 9 through 13 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 9 through 13 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 14

Ms. White: In section 14 it talks about annual reporting, and subsection (c) talks about the measures taken by the distributor corporation, including requiring licensees to take measures. What I wanted to know was what that reporting would look like. It is fairly well-defined in this, but could one of the ministers just elaborate please?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: This is really about ensuring that the legal sale of cannabis remains separate from the illicit market. Without getting into detailed specifics, it is going to be how we can look at inventory and understand that inventory and reconcile that against sales and reconcile that against the product that has arrived at that licensee and the measures taken to ensure that cannabis was not diverted to the illicit market — so how security was put in place and how we made sure that minors weren't served.

At any point in time, the notion is that there should be a tracking system on cannabis so that we can say how much is in a location. That really is about ensuring that the illicit market doesn't enter into, or is not facilitated by, a licensee.

Clause 14 agreed to

On Clause 15

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 15 through 19 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 15 through 19 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 15 through 19 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 15 through 19 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 20

Ms. White: I can tell that your copy doesn't have all my sticky notes throughout it; otherwise, you would know the page I was flipping to.

Section 20 talks about the conflict of interest, and particularly 20(1) talks about a conflict of interest within members of the board. So could I just have one of the ministers elaborate as to what we are looking for, making sure that we are aware so we don't have conflicts of interest within the board members?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: It's not very often that there is competition to answer these questions, so it's great.

The short and concise answer with respect to this is that the conflict of interests section in 20 has been included to provide absolute clarity. It requires that a board member must not have involvement directly or indirectly in any cannabis-related business. The clause is intended to ensure that members of the board do not have a conflict of interest while they have the authority to issue a licence or sanction a licensee or decide to not grant a licence. A board member, again, cannot benefit from any licensed applicant or licensee.

I think, again, it is one of these sections that provides additional clarity, but I think it is an important one because future situations, where there may be a number of versions of businesses that are involved in cannabis — there might be a cultivator, there might a small farm cultivation system, there might be a licensee, or there might be other individuals. It is also in the *Liquor Act* for the purposes of clarity there. Ideally, it is to make sure that nobody who is involved in the decision-making about who can participate in these businesses has any interest whatsoever.

Indirectly, it is an important piece as well, you know — family members or extended family members. I would suggest it goes quite far.

Clause 20 agreed to

On Clause 21

Ms. White: I'm working hard to get us through this. Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 21 through 24 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulations Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 21 through 24 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 21 through 24 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 21 to 24 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 25

Chair: Is there any debate on clause 25?

Ms. White: Clause 25 deals with licences and classes of licences. In 25(2) it talks about the licence period for a licence. There was conversation in general debate and, of course, in the briefing and I wanted to just get some clarification from the ministers — if they could give us an idea of the maximum length of time that a licence could be held by a licensee.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: We originally put it in the act and then, through back and forth in this conversation, we thought it was better to put it into the regulations. Our intention will be to have up to three years. Again, the regulations aren't complete, but I'm just giving an indication of where we're

intending to head at this point, just for the information of members opposite.

Ms. White: In section 25(5)(e), it says: “the licensee must take adequate measures to reduce the risk of cannabis that they possess for commercial purposes being diverted to an illicit market or activity, including measures required by a regulation”.

Could I just get the minister to elaborate on what that clause means?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I was sort of referring to this earlier when we were discussing an earlier clause. It's really about ensuring that, at all times, the cannabis is under control. That means things like fobbed access or controlled access. That means that you know who has access to those things. That means that there might be the provision for cameras or things like that. It's around security. It is the ability to ensure that the cannabis will remain secured throughout its time within the stores. This clause aligns with the federal *Cannabis Act* and that's one of the purposes here.

Ms. White: Section 25(5)(i) talks about “(i) the licensee must ensure that each individual who sells cannabis in the licensed premises has completed” — and we have subsections (i) and (ii). We have talked about this a bit before and this is going to be about courses. Well, I talked about my own personal experience in British Columbia with Serving it Right and how it terrified me from, in future, ever serving alcohol in British Columbia, but I just wanted to know if the ministers could elaborate a bit on where we are looking toward courses and information. I imagine that, to start with, it will be the government retailer who will have the training — and then what training are we're expecting private retailers to have?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Just earlier this week, I had a briefing with the department where they were starting to outline some of the details around the training. I will just at this point talk about the types of things that we expect to be dealing with. It's about cannabis itself, the potency, forms of use, effects, health risks and differentiating between medical and non-medical, and being able to recognize intoxication. There is now a national group which is coming out with the low-risk cannabis-use guidelines — so being informed of that and able to inform the public about that. It will be about security measures and identification for minors.

It sort of runs the gamut and I know that this work is in development now and so I don't have the full course outline as of yet, but it's sort of the equivalent of Be a Responsible Server for cannabis. I will leave it there just to give an overview of what we're anticipating.

Ms. White: I thank the minister for that answer. In clause 25(5)(j) it says: “cannabis must not be sold at premises at which a product or substance, or a cannabis accessory, within the meaning of the Cannabis Act, is also sold, to the extent that a regulation respecting such a sale prohibits it”. In my mind, I'm imagining this is co-location, for example, with alcohol — if that's right, if I could just get confirmation from a minister — and then what other examples they might have in (j).

Hon. Mr. Streicker: As the member opposite suggested, this is about alcohol. We are going to be developing this in regulations, and it is not there yet. This is the ability to allow for this type of provision. We didn't want to get so explicit as to say that it was just one thing because we thought there may be differences in the future. This has to do with the fact that cannabis is changing, and we needed to allow there to be the ability under regulation to ensure our primary objectives of displacing the illicit trade and maintaining wellness and information with a focus on youth. Given that, we thought that the best way to do this was to just talk about regulations that could anticipate differences in the future. The only one that we had contemplated at this point was alcohol.

Clause 25 agreed to

On Clause 26

Clause 26 agreed to

On Clause 27

Ms. White: Clause 27 talks about duties of president on receipt of application. We have talked a lot about this and how a lot of these decisions will be made in regulations. I was wondering if there was a ballpark time frame from upon the receipt of a completed application — because there is language that talks about not completed — from the second it is received by the president to the possible approval. Is there a ballpark idea of how long it would take for an application to be approved to become a retailer?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: Once an application is deemed complete, there is a requirement for three weeks of notification to be put out, so that has to be factored into the timeline. Following that, it would come to the next board meeting — within a couple or a few weeks is when that is likely to happen. I think what we are saying is that it is probably going to be between four and six weeks, but certainly under two months.

I want to correct myself, Mr. Chair. It is three weeks of notification, but there is an additional week of time. While that is happening, it is possible that someone from the public could say that they have a concern. They get an additional week at the tail-end for the corporation to receive that concern, so there are four weeks of time there, and then it would come to the next available board meeting.

If there is a concern that is raised and a request for a public hearing, then we go to a public hearing. Those things will adjust, depending on whether there are concerns raised by the public or not. The minimum is four weeks and then the next board meeting.

Ms. White: Just for clarification, four weeks and then the next board meeting — and then is there a time frame after that or could it be approved as quickly as, for example, four weeks if there were no concerns raised?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: If there are no objections and there is no hearing that is held, and there has been the requisite amount of time and the notification has gone out, there is another period of time — that extra week — that allows for any objection to be heard, and then the next constituted board meeting — if there are no objections and the

board so deems it — of course, they do all of their due diligence around that decision-making. But if the question from the member opposite is — if everything is in order, then it could happen right then.

Within five days of making that decision, the board must provide notice of the decision with reasons to the applicant and post the outcome online. There is still another small window of time when this information becomes public information, but that is five days. Technically, the decision is made when the board makes it, but there is a period of time to inform the applicant, the potential licensee and the public, including rationale for that decision.

Ms. White: That is great because I was wondering — if an application goes in, how often does the board meet? Is there ever going to be a timeline with multiple weeks between a board meeting and the application process, or is that going to be a fluid thing when it gets started?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: What we anticipate right now is using the existing Liquor Corporation and using the existing board — the liquor board — to act in this role. That board meets, at this point, roughly once a month, so it is not every week but it is not that far off. I have said that the team is working hard on regulations now. We will get there, we will get the licensing procedures in place, and I expect at that point that there may be some interest.

As we have been talking with the private sector, we hope to receive that interest, and so there might be a little bit of difference at the very beginning to try to deal with the transition to the private sector. I think we will play that by ear. We will be working with the board to make sure that they are up to speed and feeling prepped on process and information and everything leading up to it. It might be a little bit different at the beginning in order to accommodate this desire to get private sector licensees in place.

Clause 27 agreed to

On Clause 28

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 28 through 34 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 28 through 34 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 28 through 34 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agree to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 28 through 34 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 35

Ms. White: Clause 35 deals with no application after refusal. There are lots of different points in here. Clauses 35(1) and (2) talk about if an applicant is refused and if an applicant chooses to pull back their application. For both of those it has a six-month time frame before they can reapply.

We talked a bit about that in Committee of the Whole. Can one of the ministers explain why those are the same timelines for two different situations? Clause 35(1) is for an application that is denied and 35(2) is for when the applicant pulls back the application. They both have a six-month waiting period.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: What we are trying to prevent — and, of course, I hope it never happens — is a situation of having applications that are repetitive or — I will use a term and I don't know how well it's used, but I will say “nuisance” applications. What I want to say is that the intention is that, when an application comes forward and if it is genuine, we will continue to work with that applicant to ensure that it is ready to go and complete. An application isn't in until it is complete. In other words, if someone brings something forward and they have to delay something, that is not going to trigger this, as I understand it. It has to be — I have applied, it is deemed complete and is in the process, and then I withdraw it. I think that, in most cases where we are going to see some delays because conditions may have changed for the applicant for whatever reason, we will work on that. The distributor corporation will work with that applicant until such time as their application is complete, and then we start this rule.

In both cases it is just to say — if you got into the process and you lined everything up and then you say, “Sorry, I don't wish to be here”, or you are told no or the board does not grant you that application, then you have to wait a period of time before you get back in. I think it is a non-trivial amount of time, and we chose six months.

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

In the same section, “No application after refusal”, in clause (4), it says: “For the purposes of paragraphs (3)(c) and (d), an individual is considered to be a directing mind of a corporation or partnership if the individual is a director, officer or partner, or otherwise controls the operations of the corporation or partnership, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly.”

When we had conversations in Committee of the Whole, we were talking about, for example, a silent partner and other similar things, so if a minister could expand on clause (4), that would be fantastic.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: This is really just trying to prevent sort of a bait-and-switch type of thing, where you have some person who is not openly named then coming back in and doing a second application, which is virtually the same application again. It is just really making sure we don't have an indirect reapplication and that it is covered by the ban.

Clause 35 agreed to

On Clause 36

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 36 to 44 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 36 through 44 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole

to deem clauses 36 through 44 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 36 through 44 deemed read and agreed to
On Clause 45

Ms. White: Clause 45 talks about cancellation of a licence and we discussed this a little bit, but 45(1)(b) talks about — if the contravention is so serious that it is not appropriate to issue a warning to the licensee to vary the conditions, the licence gets suspended. Could we just get an example of what could be so awful that this would happen?

Hon. Mr. Streicker: An example of this might be selling to minors. Those are the types of things that we would perceive to be very serious, and we would want to act directly.

Clause 45 agreed to

On Clause 46

Ms. White: Clause 46 deals with forfeiture of cannabis. We had some conversations about this in Committee of the Whole — how it could be bought back, for example, if it was expired; it would be collected if it was illegal and it would be disposed of. I believe that is all in section 46. If one of the ministers can expand on that section, that would be great.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I know that lots of people have dreamed about being the person responsible for the disposal of cannabis.

I will just come to the notes here. If a notice of suspension or cancellation requires it, or where a licence expires or becomes void, the licensee must return the cannabis in their possession to the president — so to the corporation.

When cannabis has been returned to the president, as described above, and it can be sold and is from a legal source, the president will be required to compensate the licensee for the cost of the cannabis. The Government of Yukon may make a regulation that delineates the payment structure for cannabis that has been returned to the president because of suspension, cancellation or expiration of a licence. Any cannabis that has been returned to the president that has not been purchased must be destroyed. The president cannot purchase or destroy cannabis that is under order by the Supreme Court — so if it's part of a court case. If an appeal of a suspension or cancellation is overturned by the board, the president must compensate the licensee for any cannabis that was destroyed.

Clause 46 agreed to

On Clause 47

Clause 47 agreed to

On Clause 48

Ms. White: Section 48 deals with the inspection of licensed premises. This obviously deals with inspection. If a minister would like to paraphrase what section 48 talks about — section 48(2) talks about if you would require the ability to go into private homes — so if that would include RCMP or inspectors or what that would look like — so, inspections.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: With respect to inspections, there is quite a bit of information here but I'm happy to paraphrase.

An inspector can enter licensed premises. They can enter a premises that was licensed but where the licence is no longer valid for any reason — cancellation, suspension, et cetera — if cannabis has not been provided to the president. From the last discussion, it's required to be given to the president when they are no longer licensed. They can also enter a location that is not licensed if there is a reason to believe that the licensee has cannabis at that location, or presumably anyone has cannabis at that location that is not appropriately licensed. If the location is a private residence, the inspector would require a warrant. An inspector here would be an individual who is delineated as, or designated as, an inspector pursuant to this legislation or an RCMP member.

An inspector must provide identification to verify that they are an inspector, if requested; they may seize cannabis, if it is illicit cannabis; they can seize cannabis if the time required to obtain a warrant would result in the destruction of evidence; and the inspector may also take samples of the cannabis for testing and may make copies of any documents they require or seize from the premises. Also, under this section, the inspectors are required to provide a receipt for the cannabis seized or documents removed, and any documents taken must be returned within five days, and they must — under this section of the legislation, tracking of seizures are very important, especially in the event of an appeal of the case.

Section 49 goes on — I won't go there yet — to deal with if cannabis is seized by an inspector — an inspector defined as an inspector designated as such or an RCMP member.

Clause 48 agreed to

On Clause 49

Ms. White: Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 49 through 52 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 49 through 52 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 49 through 52 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 49 through 52 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 53

Ms. White: I am sure it surprises you, Mr. Chair, that I stood up.

In section 53, we talk about sale, et cetera, of cannabis. In section 53(d), it talks about the distributor corporation or the licensee. The reason why I am asking the questions is I am not so concerned about the distributor having the information of what has been sold to a retailer or a licensee, but I am more concerned about the information that a licensee would have in the sale to an individual.

In (d)(i), it says: “keeps appropriate records respecting their activities in relation to cannabis that they possess...” and it goes on in section (d) to talk about records of sales and purchases of cannabis. I just wanted some clarification on that section.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: This is again to that point that I was stating — that we need to be able to track it at all times. This is required under the federal law, as I have noted. The main purpose of it is to make sure it doesn't divert to the illicit market and that the illicit doesn't divert into it.

The Government of Yukon has the power to proscribe measures in regulation to achieve this — for example, security requirements for retail outlets, timelines for the reporting of cannabis inventory and sales. In addition to any proscribed regulations, the licensees and the corporation are responsible to take adequate measures to prevent illegal diversion, as I spoke about earlier.

The corporation and licensees are responsible for ensuring that the staff are trained, especially as we outline in regulation. The intent of that training is to ensure that consumers are able to access cannabis in a manner that provides for safe and informed consumption. The corporation and licensees are responsible for ensuring that co-location of proscribed products through regulations is also addressed.

Just one more point — the Liquor Corporation, at this point, is doing a privacy impact assessment to ensure protection of privacy in seller and legislative authorities. We're just doing that review right now, Mr. Chair.

Clause 53 agreed to

On Clause 54

Clause 54 agreed to

On Clause 55

Clause 55 agreed to

On Clause 56

Clause 56 agreed to

On Clause 57

Clause 57 agreed to

On Clause 58

Ms. White: Clause 58 talks about the cultivation of cannabis and 58(1) says: “A person must not cultivate, propagate or harvest cannabis, or offer to do so, unless the person is an individual and does so in accordance...” and then it lists the accordance items. I imagine, at a certain point in time, people will have greener thumbs than other people. Would someone be able to do this as a profession? Would someone be able to help another person grow and cultivate their four legal cannabis plants?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: The short answer is no. The federal government licenses the growers and ultimately the distributors of cannabis. If somebody made an application to be a licensee under that process, under the federal government process, and is properly licensed to do so, then yes, you could grow on behalf of other individuals. Again, this prohibits someone like me, perhaps, who can't grow plastic plants, from having my neighbour or friend grow my four plants. It's not contemplated as lawful.

The only other piece I would like to add is that there is a concept in the federal government scheme that there would be very large distributors, but also perhaps small farms or small distributors, and if that's what the question contemplates, then again, that would be licensed by the federal government.

Ms. White: I think I did a bad job of explaining myself. The example I would have is that the Yukon government building has many plants throughout the building. They are owned by the Yukon government. They stay where they reside and we have a professional who comes and waters those plants. In my office, they pull off dead leaves, because there is a lot because we don't have any windows.

What I'm talking about is not so much the transfer of one plant from, for example, me to the Member for Whitehorse Centre, but if the Member for Whitehorse Centre had four plants and I was a much better gardener and I decided I want to retire from politics, I would like to be a gardener and I would like to specialize in cannabis, would I be able to do that as a profession?

Hon. Ms. McPhee: No. I'm sorry about that, but no, not in this contemplated legislation. Friends who reside with you — plants are permitted in dwelling-houses under section 58(2)(b), but not professional gardeners — if that helps. It may have been my answer that was confused last time.

Clause 58 agreed to

On Clause 59

Ms. White: Clause 59 deals with the consumption of cannabis in general. Clause 59(3) talks about where an individual may not consume cannabis in a dwelling-house, and 59(3)(b) talks about in the presence of a health care worker, probation officer, social worker or other individual in a prescribed class of individuals who are providing services. It goes on to explain that a bit. From my understanding, it is similar to the WCB's *Smoke-Free Places Act*. You can't put someone else at risk with your choosing to smoke tobacco. Can I just get confirmation and maybe elaboration on that part? That would be great.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: The Member for Takhini-Kopper King is correct. It is about, as has been described by her, the fact of not putting people who are, for the purposes of their employment or their work, in the presence of somebody in their home to carry out that work from being exposed to that kind of smoke. The last part of subsection (3)(b)(ii) is: "... has requested that the individual not do so in their presence." There is obviously an opportunity there if that was not that person's choice, but it protects workers.

Clause 59 agreed to

On Clause 60

Ms. White: Clause 60 deals with nursing homes. When we talk about how we want people where they can age in place, when we talk about how they are home — whether it is the continuing care facility or something similar — I just want to know for sure that, when we talk about nursing homes, government will be looking toward designating specific spots. For example, right now, we have smoking areas outside of nursing homes. I just want to make sure that, once it is

legalized, that we have the same rights for people who are choosing to smoke cannabis outside of nursing homes.

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Again, the Member for Takhini-Kopper King is correctly interpreting this. Adults who live in nursing homes, et cetera — homes for the aged or disabled persons — will only be permitted to consume cannabis in designated areas as defined by the *Smoke-Free Places Act*. The *Smoke-Free Places Act* designates smoking areas for the purposes of those kinds of residences and we anticipate the same thing will happen in this situation.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I would like to add a point here. As we drafted this legislation, it was understood that, at this phase of the federal legislation, it was really dealing with smoke — vaping — so those modes of consumption that are like tobacco in many ways. As those things change, then we can anticipate different sets of rules.

We have always understood that, when it comes to consumption, it happens in a way that is not impacting people nearby and that there would be different rules as we get there.

That's one of the things that we can see over time.

Clause 60 agreed to

On Clause 61

Ms. White: Mr. Chair, we are so close. Pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, I request the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 61 through 79 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Unanimous consent re deeming Clauses 61 through 79 of Bill No. 15 read and agreed to

Chair: Ms. White has, pursuant to Standing Order 14.3, requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem clauses 61 through 79 of Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, read and agreed to.

Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

Clauses 61 through 79 deemed read and agreed to

On Clause 80

Ms. White: I was determined to get to my favourite section of this bill, which is in "Regulations". It was pointed out to me by a very intelligent individual that section 80, under "Regulations", is where I'm going to find the ability, I hope, that Yukon government, "respecting sales of cannabis accessories within the meaning of the Cannabis Act" — this is section 80(1)(m) — that this is when government has the ability to disallow the sale of cannabis paraphernalia in locations that do not sell cannabis. I'm talking about gas stations and corner stores and gift shops. If we want to talk about not promoting the consumption of cannabis and we want to talk about making sure that young people aren't being exposed to cannabis and cannabis products in that exposure, then I believe that section 80(1)(m) is going to give us that ability.

I just wanted to know if the ministers have any thoughts about that. I realize this will be in regulations and this is future and forward-thinking, but I think it would be fantastic if I

didn't have to explain to my 10-year-old nephew what different cannabis paraphernalia was when we go to the gas station.

My hope is that section 80(1)(m) will help us do that.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: This is indeed where that regulation will be developed or the act here allows for that to happen. What I want to say is that we recognize what the member opposite is discussing. We too want to not promote the use of cannabis with young people. On the other hand, we also recognize that cannabis will be legal and I want to say that there is a tension out there. For example, the private sector has approached us to talk about why they shouldn't be able to sell certain items. All right, so that's a discussion that is coming. Let me acknowledge the concerns that are being raised. We too have flagged them at this point.

When it comes to cannabis paraphernalia within stores that sell cannabis, there is an opportunity to do some education of people who will be of age.

What I want to say is that we are aware of the concerns that are being raised. We are also hearing from other members of the public who have a different opinion and we will have to carefully weigh those things as we draft the regulations. When we get into that engagement, we will mentally flag this and try to draw it to the attention of the member opposite and allow for her input.

Ms. White: Just before we finish up right now, I want to thank the three officials who are in the Chamber, but also the other half dozen or so who I met with over our briefings and the multitudes who worked behind the scenes to bring this forward. I do look forward to being able to talk about regulations as they get developed in the future.

Like I said in my second reading speech, this is the biggest thing since prohibition, so I appreciate the work that has been done on it. I especially appreciate the patience and the direction when we were going through the briefings and, again, from the ministers as we work through it.

Thank you for the time and the opportunity and, of course, the good work that happened before and the mountains of work that will happen as we move toward legalization. Thank you very much for your efforts.

Mr. Cathers: Just in this area, and I understand the that the Minister responsible for the Liquor Corporation is indicating that some of the rules pertaining to the sale of accessories will be considered and developed further, I would just like to note for the record and for the consideration of the minister and all his colleagues here that the concern that I have heard from some Yukoners who are interested in getting into the legal retail of cannabis is that — in one case, it is fair to say they were quite surprised and, I think it is fair to say, puzzled by the notion that there was a potential that they might not be able to sell accessories like rolling papers or pipes or bongs or other accessories.

I would just ask the minister if he could clarify whether that is government's intent to prevent the sale of things like rolling papers at a legally licensed cannabis retailer once they issue those licences and, if so, if he could explain why. In the absence of an explanation, to me, it seems that it is similar to

saying that you can't sell a corkscrew at a liquor store. I am quite honestly not seeing any reason why there is any problem with allowing a licensed cannabis retailer to also sell accessories and provide advice and education to their customers on understanding the various ways and what the effects will be if they are consuming certain cannabis products or using certain cannabis accessories, whether it be bongs, rolling papers or so on.

If the minister could elaborate on that, it would be appreciated because, again, in the absence of an explanation, it just doesn't seem to make any sense that there would somehow be an increased risk to the public from allowing a legally licensed cannabis retailer to also provide someone with the accessories — and why there would somehow be a benefit to government or the public to require someone to purchase those at a different store.

Hon. Mr. Streicker: I thank the member opposite for his questions and concerns. Similar to the offer that I made to the Member for Takhini-Kopper King, I will say that, when we get down to this regulation, I will try to flag it for both of them.

I will give the exact same answer that I just gave. It's not so much about regulating what is going in the stores; it's about trying to manage the tension between how and where accessories are sold to, on the one hand, provide opportunities for the private sector to do what it does well, and, on the other hand, to manage our desire to not promote cannabis to youth.

It's trying to keep those two things in check. We have not taken any decisions on this. We put it in here in the act to allow us to have that thoughtful consideration of this. Given that I'm hearing from both parties, the Official Opposition and the Third Party, that they are interested in this topic, we are happy to keep them informed as that discussion develops. I appreciate that he's raising those concerns here today.

Mr. Cathers: I appreciate the minister's answer and would just again leave with a notation that, in the absence of someone coming forward with a good reason that I might not be aware of — not being an expert in all matters related to cannabis — I have been looking at this entirely from a policy perspective and have never touched it myself. I don't profess to be an expert in all areas related to accessories. Perhaps there are some I'm not aware of — where there might be a problem with selling it in a cannabis retail store — but the ones that I'm aware of — again, in the absence of someone pointing out a problem with why someone who is a licensed cannabis retailer should not also sell the accessories, it would seem to be that, in a cannabis retail shop, that's already going to be a location where there are restrictions around the ability of children to access the location, or they may or may not even be allowed to go there. There are the same issues around accessing the cannabis at the retail store and seeing the display of cannabis accessories, which would, by its nature, have the ability to provide some protections to young people.

Leaving open the possibility that there are accessories that I'm not aware of and that there would be a problem selling, it would just seem to me that, if a retailer is being

allowed to sell cannabis, they should also be allowed to sell any accessories that are legal to be sold.

I would just leave the minister with that suggestion. I sincerely appreciate his undertaking to engage with both the Member for Takhini-Kopper King and me as work goes on in developing regulations in this area.

I think that wraps up my comments, unless something else develops in debate. I will just take this final opportunity to thank the minister and to thank the officials who have been involved in this work for all of their efforts on this.

I would note, in concluding my comments, that although we do disagree with some of the policy decisions made by Cabinet, we do think, overall, that government collectively, including the officials providing policy advice and the legal drafters, has, generally speaking, done a good job on this legislation, and I thank everyone who has been involved in that as well as the public consultation process.

Clause 80 agreed to

On Clause 81

Clause 81 agreed to

On Title

Title agreed to

Hon. Ms. McPhee: Mr. Chair, I move that you report Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, without amendment.

Chair: It has been moved by Ms. McPhee that the Chair report Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Ms. McPhee: I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Chair: It has been moved by Ms. McPhee that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Mr. Hutton: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 15, entitled *Cannabis Control and Regulation Act*, and directed me to report the bill without amendment.

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

Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

The time being 5:30 p.m., this House now stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

The following sessional papers were tabled April 18, 2018:

34-2-56

Yukon Law Foundation Annual Report — November 1, 2016 to October 31, 2017 (McPhee)

34-2-57

Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges Second Report (April 17, 2018) (Gallina)

The following legislative returns were tabled April 18, 2018:

34-2-128

Response to oral question from Mr. Kent re: F.H. Collins Secondary School sports field (Streicker)

34-2-129

Response to matter outstanding from discussion with Ms. White, related to general debate on Vote 51, Department of Community Services, in Bill No. 206, *First Appropriation Act 2018-19* (Streicker)

34-2-130

Response to Written Question No. 22 re: greenhouse gas reductions for the years 2019 to 2022 (Frost)

The following document was filed April 18, 2018

34-2-52

Performance audit of Family and Children's Services within Yukon's Department of Health and Social Services, letter re (dated April 16, 2018) from Patti McLeod, Member for Watson Lake, to Michael Ferguson, Auditor General of Canada (McLeod)

The following written questions were tabled April 18, 2018:

Written Question No. 25

Re: Fox Lake local area planning process (Cathers)

Written Question No. 26

Re: residential housing in Whitehorse (Van Bibber)