Mr. Speaker, today I rise in this House to pay tribute to the annual Territorial Skills Competition which will be held at Yukon College this coming Friday, April 3.

Mr. Speaker, the continued demand for skilled workers across Yukon has placed a renewed value on skilled labour. Yukon requires people with skills and knowledge to address the needs in our community. Skilled workers themselves continue to enjoy a wide array of job opportunities. Those who are interested in being trained for a career in the trades can look forward to a very bright future indeed. Yukon’s rich mineral, oil and gas deposits promise a bright future. Coupled with construction and industry opportunities, this means that young people who want to stay here at home in Yukon to work, raise their families and build a life with a career in trades in Yukon, will have that opportunity. Skilled labour and people working in the trades are our future.

We know that it is very important to give young people the opportunity to explore career options so they can make informed decisions about their future. The Territorial Skills Competition this Friday will do that by providing Yukon high school students and apprentices with a unique hands-on experience in a number of trades. This is the 11th Skills Canada Territorial Skills Competition, and every year an impressive array of trades and technologies are showcased at the event.

Last year there were 16 separate disciplines being demonstrated or competed in, and I know that many of the students who participated in the event enjoyed the opportunity to spend a day as a small-engine repair technician, an electrician, a sheet-metal worker, an autobody painter, or in autobody repair.

Also, Mr. Speaker, carpentry, cabinetmaking, baking, hairstyling, IT, software — the field is endless for these students and apprentices.

Students from Watson Lake, Carcross, Dawson City, Ross River, Pelly Crossing, Beaver Creek, Haines Junction, Teslin and as far north as Old Crow will travel to Whitehorse to participate in the event this week.

Not only are these young people going to have a fun and exciting day, they will come away from it with a sense of opportunity, more ideas about their future, and new goals for themselves.

We appreciate the tremendous effort it takes from so many people to make this day happen, and I would like to extend a very big thank you to all of our partners in this venture, and primarily, all of the volunteers, staff and organizers at Skills Canada Yukon. Mr. Speaker, representing Skills Canada Yukon here is their executive director, Mr. Dan Curtis, who is with us in the gallery today.

Applause

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Skills Canada Yukon is a valuable partner with the Yukon government in delivering skills trade education to Yukon youth, and our government is proud to be able to support their work. There are so many volunteers who have given freely of their time to participate in the event, and I would like to extend a heartfelt thank you to them also. Without those volunteers, an event like this could not happen. I’m confident that the events on Friday, April 3 at Yukon College will provide our youth with a new awareness of the possibilities that await them with a career in trades.

Mr. Fairclough: I rise today on behalf of the Official Opposition to pay tribute to the 11th annual Yukon Territorial Skills Competition, being held at Yukon College on Friday, April 3.

Skills Canada Yukon has been able to offer our Yukon youth unparalleled opportunities for learning about skilled trades and technology. The programs offered to our youth at the Skills Centre have been developed to accommodate a wide area of interest.

To compete nationally in both the Skills Canada competition and the workforce, extracurricular instruction is needed. Community volunteers, many of whom are professionals in their field, offer their time and expertise to our youth who want to learn. Clubs were formed after school, with mentors from both industry and our education system to help our youth further their skills in the trades.

The Territorial Skills Competition this Friday will provide our Yukon high school students and apprentices from across the territory with hands-on experience in a number of trades. There has been a shortage of skilled workers across the Yukon and Canada. This shortage has presented a wide array of job opportunities in the trades and technology field for our youth. It has given them a chance to explore the many job opportunities available with a career in trades.

The outcome of the territorial competition will determine who will be going to the 15th annual National Skills Competition being held in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, on May 20 to 23. Good luck this weekend to all competitors.

Over the years since its inception, there have been a number of competitors representing the Yukon at different skills
competitions and this year is no exception. Yukoner Karl Loos will compete in the Canadian Skills Competition in Calgary, which will draw over 1,000 competitors from 50 countries. He, along with 35 other Canadians, is in training to represent Canada at the World Skills Competition in September. We wish you all the best of luck in your upcoming competition. We are very proud of all the youth, as they are our Yukon ambassadors.

We would also like to thank the following: the staff and management of Skills Canada, Mr. Dan Curtis, who is with us here today, and all of the volunteers who have given so freely of their time and expertise in mentoring our youth — a job well done.

Thank you.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise today on behalf of the NDP caucus to pay tribute to Skills Canada Yukon and this year’s 11th annual Territorial Skills Competition which, as we’ve already heard, is going to take place tomorrow from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at Yukon College. I have had the privilege of working with Skills Canada Yukon and judging some of the competitions before, and I’m going to have the opportunity tomorrow, as well, to judge the sheet metal competition. I really look forward to that. I think there’s a certain sense of accomplishment when you look into the eyes of the young people who are actually creating the projects. That’s what I find when I have the opportunity to work with young women exploring trades in the welding workshop — the sense of accomplishment these young men and women actually feel when they’ve created something with their hands and with their minds. It takes a lot of thought and skill to do that.

Students and apprentices with the diverse variety of skills from every corner of the territory will be at the college this weekend for the skills competition. There are a wide range of skills on display, including electrical wiring, cabinetmaking, carpentry, hairdressing, culinary arts, baking, auto service, graphic design, IT software, autobody repair and painting, welding, heavy-duty mechanics, sheet metal and many other skills.

On a personal note, when I was a young man in junior high school, I had the opportunity to participate — it wasn’t called a skills club at that time and there wasn’t a great organization like Skills Canada Yukon in British Columbia, but there was a culinary arts after-school club.

It was a great way for a young fellow to learn about cooking, and now those skills still serve me well to this day.

We need skilled trades workers in Canada. Skilled trades are responsible for a great amount of our collective wealth as a society. Skills clubs and skills competitions are a great way to expose young men and women to the value of a trade and the pride that one feels when completing a good project. Skills clubs give students access to industry-level skills training, and can lead to employment opportunities. They increase students’ self-esteem by supporting their interests and showcasing their accomplishments. Our schools benefit greatly from having skills clubs. Our country and territory benefit from the role that Skills Canada Yukon and the skills clubs play in developing the next generation of young workers with the skills that industries are requiring.

The NDP caucus also is very concerned that young workers are not injured or killed on the job, and that they are given proper training and instruction so that they are safe on the job. Skills Canada Yukon, through these skills clubs, provides young men and women with instruction and the opportunity to use the tools of the trades safely, and provides that safety training.

I express a big thank you to Skills Canada Yukon and to all those who make up the organization and put on the skills competition — the judges, the mentors, the employers, labour organizations, the Department of Education and the schoolteachers who participate and, of course, the most important people — the participants in the skills competition and we wish them all the best tomorrow.

Speaker: Are there any further tributes?

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Lang: I’d like to welcome Her Worship, Bev Buckway, Mayor of Whitehorse, to the House this afternoon.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any further introductions of visitors?

Are there returns or documents for tabling?

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions?

Are there any bills to be introduced?

Are there any notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

Hon. Ms. Horne: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Canada and its NATO allies to insist, in the strongest possible terms, that the Government of Afghanistan fully honour its human rights treaty obligations under the international laws and demonstrate its commitment, both in law and in practice, to respect, protect and enforce the equality rights of the women of Afghanistan, or face international sanctions.

Mr. Mitchell: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Yukon government to move quickly, in consultation with First Nations, the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition and its member non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders, to identify potential housing projects and to design and construct additional affordable housing, using the $50 million announced in the federal 2009 budget, in order to address:

(1) the serious problem of Yukoners living in substandard housing or without any permanent housing;

(2) the needs of the numerous Yukoners who have self-identified in a recent survey by the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition as saying they couldn’t afford their current housing:
(3) the needs of the numerous Yukoners who responded to the recent survey by the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition by reporting they have no access to cooking facilities;

(4) the needs of the numerous Yukoners who have responded to the recent survey by the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition that their housing situation is not stable;

(5) the startling number of respondents in the recent survey by the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition who reported that they couch surf, live in vehicles or tents or rely on the shelter for a warm place to sleep.

Mr. Elias: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House supports the repeal of the long-gun registry requirements in the current federal Long-gun Registry Act.

Mr. Cardiff: I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Yukon government to work with the Friends of McIntyre Creek, Kwanlin Dun First Nation, Ta’an Kwäch’än Council, Porter Creek Community Association, Takhini North Community Association, Yukon College, Yukon Conservation Society, the Klondike Snowmobile Association, the Yukon Orienteering Club, Yukon Electrical, Icy Waters, the Whitehorse Ski Club, the Rock-Climbing Club, the Yukon Fish and Game Association, the Dog Powered Sports Association and the Yukon Bird Club, with the purpose of preserving McIntyre Creek, its wetlands and environs so that this important parcel of wilderness will be enjoyed by all Yukoners long into the future.

I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House is of the opinion that the Government of Canada should increase the cash reserve of the Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board and explain to Canadian workers what has happened to the $54-billion surplus from the employment insurance fund.

Speaker: Are there any further notices of motion? Hearing none, is there a statement by a minister? This then brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board chair appointment

Mr. Fairclough: I have a question for the Deputy Premier. Our Standing Order 45(3.2) reads, I quote: “The Standing Committee on Appointments to Major Government Boards and Committees: (a) shall review nominations and recommend appointments to the following major boards and committees...”

Mr. Speaker, the Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board is one of the major government boards listed in the Standing Orders. As we are all aware, the chair of Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board was recently reappointed without any input from the standing committee. My question for the Deputy Premier, the chair of the Standing Committee on Appointments to Major Government Boards and Committees: does she support her government’s decision to bypass this committee?

Hon. Mr. Hart: For the member opposite, with regard to the recent appointment, that appointment was on a temporary basis until such time as the committee can be convened and that issue can be brought up before that committee. The expiry date had come up and it is within my right to do so on a temporary basis. It is a temporary issuance for the chair until the end of May.

Mr. Fairclough: This issue would have been brought up at the last meeting. I don’t see why the government can’t see that far ahead. Now, this is about due process and we have all agreed to follow that process for major government appointments. This standing committee makes sure that every voice is heard and that the process for these appointments is followed, but the government has ignored that process.

This government is not calling for the standing committee to do its job. This government has unilaterally made this major decision, even though it’s temporary, and we found out about that after the deal was done. Mr. Speaker, we know that’s wrong, and they do too. Why was this appointment not brought to the Standing Committee on Appointments to Major Government Boards and Committees?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I would like to thank the member opposite for the question regarding the committee. I’d just like to bring it to the member opposite’s attention that it’s actually this Yukon Party government that implemented and stated the very importance of this major Standing Committee on Appointments to Major Government Boards and Committees. It was our government that actually put it in place, and it has been underway for some time now.

I’m very proud of the work, the very great work by consensus that members opposite and members of the government have done to ensure that appointments are made.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, just moments ago, the Government House Leader tabled a motion in the Legislature calling for a change in the makeup of the standing committee. Given that things have changed — the makeup of the members of the Legislature has in fact changed over the course of the last number of months — so it’s to reflect the changes in the standing committee. Once those changes have been formally made, I certainly will be calling for a meeting to discuss the appointment that is in question.

Mr. Fairclough: They set up a process, then ignore it. They say one thing and do another, Mr. Speaker. There’s something wrong with this. This government knows when these appointment terms end, and they could be dealing with it way ahead of time.

I see the minister got a note here, so I’m expecting a good answer.

This government has gone off on its own and appointed the chair of the Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board, in spite of the fact that there’s a fair and inclusive process for making this decision.

This is not a one-time incident, Mr. Speaker. We just received another OIC for the chairman of the Workers’ Compensation Health and Safety Board Appeal Tribunal. Again, no
input, no discussions, no due process. So why is the government ignoring the Standing Orders?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I would again remind the members opposite that it was this government that actually created the Standing Committee on Appointments to Major Government Boards and Committees. It is this government that has had this process fully underway, and I'm very proud of the collective efforts of all members opposite, as well as members on the government side.

Unfortunately, the Member for Mayo-Tatchun does not see it that way.

As I relayed just moments ago, the Member for Lake Laberge, in his capacity as the Government House Leader, did stand up and table a motion to reflect the makeup and changes that have occurred in our Legislative Assembly as a result of changing seats, so to speak. Once the actual committee has been debated on the floor of the Legislature and there has been a new composition reflecting those changes, there will be a meeting called.

I will remind the member opposite that we will continue to do our good work.

Question re: Government employee cross-cultural education

Mr. McRobb: A letter to the editor was published in a local paper on Wednesday of last week that has infuriated several Yukoners and many of my constituents in particular. The letter was premised on an outdated perspective that should have died with the signing of the Umbrella Final Agreement in the previous century, as well as several First Nation agreements.

The letter writer’s perspective is completely void of any understanding of today’s reality in our territory. First Nation harvesting rights are written into our laws and it is a constitutional right. A quick Google search has revealed the letter writer is employed by the Yukon government.

Is the Premier aware of this situation?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I must confess I spend very little of my time, while governing the territory and building its future, reading letters to the editor. Obviously the Member for Klwan does take some time in doing so, and that would be his choice.

Am I aware of this letter? No. Am I aware of the constitutional rights of First Nations and what they’ve achieved in their land claim negotiations and what the Umbrella Final Agreement, as a framework document, obligates government to do, along with our obligations through each and every treaty with each First Nation? Of course we’re well aware of it, and that’s exactly how this government conducts its affairs.

We also have a number of First Nations who have not yet settled. We are aware of our obligations in that regard and that is how we conduct our affairs in dealing with those First Nations.

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Speaker, the Yukon First Nation citizens have rights to subsistence harvest in their traditional territory. It is an intrinsic part of their culture. I am aware of several who practise a strict subsistence diet and the vast majority depend on harvesting from the land to supplement their diet. We are also aware of the high incidence of health disorders among First Nations people, and these are directly related to the western diet.

Letters like this do a disservice to our territory. Sure, everybody is entitled to their right to express their opinion but it is quite unsettling to realize that such destructive opinions are held by an employee who is so readily connected to the Government of Yukon. What has the Premier done in response to this letter? Has he considered issuing a bulletin to government employees?

Speaker: Before the Hon. Premier answers, I need to just talk with one of my Table Officers here, please.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I could offer this sage advice to the Member for Klwan: write a letter to the editor refuting this letter that he has apparently read and takes such issue with.

Second, I’m very hesitant to accept the member’s opinion on this. I would believe that all Yukoners have a right to voice their opinion, whether they’re an employee of the government or not.

Third, to suggest that the government somehow is following this course of action — a matter of opinion written in a newspaper — is absolutely absurd.

Mr. McRobb: There is a lot at stake here, including our international reputation as a place renowned for its added features of justice and aboriginal self-determination that enhance our uniqueness. Our society must move beyond yesterday’s rhetoric, and the government must act responsibly to set a good example.

The Yukon government workforce is represented by employees who work on the front line in dealing with the public. Previous governments have recognized the need to ensure its employees understand today’s laws with respect to Yukon First Nation rights and responsibilities in our territory. It used to be mandatory for employees to take training on cultural education, as well as on the Umbrella Final Agreement. The Yukon government is expected to ensure its employees are up to snuff with today’s laws. What action has the Premier taken as a result of this letter to step up Umbrella Final Agreement awareness within our workforce?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, the facts are that our government continues to ensure that, across the corporate structure, our obligations in meeting the agreements signed, or the obligations therein, are being met by all departments — in all phases of governance and beyond — in creating partnerships, and developing the first ever act that ensures that a government-to-government relationship is enshrined in law; in developing joint processes, like the Child Care Act review, like the correctional reform process, like education reform, the joint forest management plan in the southwest Yukon with the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, the Forest Stewardship Council and all its work done jointly with the Kaska First Nation in the southeast Yukon. The list goes on and on and on.

I sense here that the Member for Klwan is pointing directly at a government employee and making some sort of accusation. Let me caution the member: this is not the place for that; take it outside the Assembly.
Some Hon. Member:  (Inaudible)

Point of order
Speaker: Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.
Mr. Mitchell: Clearly the Premier is imputing a motive that was not in the question and not the intent of the Member for Kluane under Standing Order 19(g). It is certainly an unavowed and false motive. I would ask that you ask the Premier to back away from that line.

Speaker’s ruling
Speaker: From the Chair’s perspective, the Member for Kluane has every right to ask a question of a nature that falls within the confines of our Standing Orders. I think the honourable member did that. From the Chair’s perspective, there is no point of order; the member exercised his rights.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: In my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we’ll let all government employees draw their own conclusion from this discussion. Once again, let me remind the Member for Kluane that we have not seen the letter to the editor. For him to suggest on the floor of this House that the letter somehow defines how the government conducts its business under the law, under the Umbrella Final Agreement, under the treaties, under whatever, is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and the member knows it. I question the Leader of the Official Opposition for —
Some Hon. Member:  (Inaudible)

Speaker’s ruling
Speaker: Order. I knew this was going to happen. The Chair was confused on the point of order raised by the Leader of the Official Opposition. To just rewind the moment here, it was a point of order. Hon. Premier, please be very careful what you say in the future on this issue. A member has the right to say what he has the right to say in this House. It is the Chair’s job to protect that right of any member.
Leader of the Third Party, question please.

Question re:  Child and Youth Advocate Act
Mr. Hardy:  Oh boy. I love freedom of speech, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier said yesterday the government is legally obligated to bring the Child and Youth Advocate Act before this House within 12 months of the debate and passage of the Child and Family Services Act in the Legislature. He said that, by law, we’re required to have it tabled before this Assembly and put it into action now. However, I would like to draw his attention to the Child and Family Services Act, section 211(2), which states that the bill to establish a Child and Youth Advocate Act must be presented to the Legislative Assembly no later than the anniversary date of the proclamation of this act.

Well, the act has not been proclaimed, so the Premier was mistaken. I’d like to give him an opportunity to correct the public record.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I have nothing to correct, Mr. Speaker. We are obligated by that law to ensure that a child advocate is in place within 12 months, and that’s what we’re doing. The act before us relating to the child advocate is an act that creates an independent body that will report to this Legislative Assembly.

We’ve done our work, as we set out to do. I would remind the member that, after five years of consultation, of work, and jointly informing the Child and Family Services Act — the new act that is here in the Yukon — the only substantive issue that arose from that act was the need for a child advocate. The government agreed with First Nations and is delivering on that fact.

Mr. Hardy: The Premier promised the Grand Chief of the Council of Yukon First Nations in a letter, and I quote: “A partnership process to ensure community-based and First Nation government involvement in the drafting of the Child and Youth Advocate Act” — which is the part we’re talking about right now.

According to my information, only two consultation sessions were held over the course of the year with Yukon First Nations, and they have been described by the First Nations as a simple exchange of information, nothing more.

Second, a request by the Yukon First Nations for a joint working group with the Yukon government to discuss their concerns with the draft bill was denied in a letter dated January 16, 2009. At this very moment, four Yukon First Nations, calling themselves the Coalition of Northern Aboriginals for Self-Determination, are so upset that they’re holding a news conference to condemn this government for rushing this flawed bill through the Legislature.

We have about six weeks left in this sitting of the Legislature, and that’s plenty of time for the Premier to fulfill his obligations around consultation. Is he willing to do that?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: We’ve met our obligations; that’s the point. Now the member, the Leader of the Third Party, has suddenly taken the position that this is a flawed bill. How would the member know? He hasn’t even debated the bill.

This is the kind of Question Period that has no bearing on —
Some Hon. Member:  (Inaudible)

Point of order
Speaker: Order. On a point of order, Leader of the Third Party.

Mr. Hardy: The Premier indicated that I had stated that this was a flawed bill and that’s contrary to — I don’t know what section it is, but I definitely did not say that.

Speaker’s ruling
Speaker: From the Chair’s perspective, it’s a dispute among members. There is no point of order.
You have about 30 seconds, Hon. Premier.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Anyone can form an opinion. However, in the matters related to the health, well-being and safety of children, there is one opinion — making sure that, to the extent possible, we do exactly that. That’s what we have done with the new Child and Family Services Act; that’s why we brought forward the child advocate bill; that’s why we’ve created an independent body as a child advocate to report to this
Legislative Assembly. We’ve done our work; we’ve met our obligations and now we’re getting on with meeting our obligations to children.

Mr. Hardy: I sure hope that the Premier is not implying that First Nations’ concerns do not put the children in the forefront of their desire to correct this bill or have their input into it.

I have for filing a series of letters that spell out some of the main concerns the Council of Yukon First Nations and the Ta’an Kwäch’än Council have with this bill. These include, among others, refusal to consult in good faith despite repeated requests, a rushed consultation process on the draft act, and the lack of clout and independence given to the child advocate.

The Premier has once again broken faith with Yukon First Nations. It’s like déjà vu. At the very least, in the interest of maintaining goodwill, will we, the Minister of Health and Social Services, or both, immediately meet with the Coalition of Northern Aboriginals for Self-Determination and the Council of Yukon First Nations to discuss their concerns with this important child welfare legislation?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, we meet with First Nation governments all the time. We meet with the Council of Yukon First Nations. We conduct processes jointly in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, we’ve done exactly what the member is saying. That’s why the bill is before this House. As I said, and I’ll repeat: we’ve met our obligations; we’ve done our work. We have brought forward the bill, as we said and committed to First Nations we would do. It’s before the House, and now we’re getting on with the task at hand: making sure we provide every instrument possible to ensure, to the extent possible, the health, safety and well-being of children.

Question re: McIntyre Creek wetlands

Mr. Hardy: Well, last night, my colleague from Mount Lorne attended the Friends of McIntyre Creek meeting. There were over a hundred people there, and I want to list some of the organizations, composed of hundreds of members in total, that make presentations in support of creating a park for McIntyre Creek: Klondike Snowmobile Association, approximately 650 members; Whitehorse Cross Country Ski Club, over 1,200 members; Rock-Climbing Club, 150 members; Yukon Fish and Game Association, 700 members; the Dog Powered Sports Association of Yukon, a multitude of members; and the Yukon Bird Club — well, I’m sure there are as many members as there are birds in Yukon.

Now, citizens of Kwanlin Dun First Nation and Ta’an Kwäch’än also spoke at the meeting about creating the park. These are a real diversity of groups with diverse memberships, goals and objectives, but one common cause: turn McIntyre Creek and its wetlands into a park. Will the Minister of Environment listen to the thousands of people who care deeply about McIntyre Creek and turn this area into a park?

Hon. Ms. Taylor: First of all, I would like to extend our gratitude and our thanks. We would like to acknowledge the Friends of McIntyre Creek for their good work and for all their efforts in raising awareness about the very importance of this integral area to Yukon, and certainly doing the good work that they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should know full well that the Municipal Act in Yukon provides that the municipal government has jurisdiction on land use designations within municipal boundaries. This planning process, otherwise coined as the “official community plan”, is certainly underway. I know that all members related to Friends of McIntyre Creek are encouraged to contribute to that process. We certainly look forward to the outcome, and we certainly look forward to working with the City of Whitehorse and all the proponents in the future.

Mr. Hardy: In other words, the Yukon government doesn’t really give two hoots about it.

Now, Whitehorse prides itself as a wilderness city. A wilderness city doesn’t mean an urban space merely surrounded by wilderness. It means that wild spaces, large core areas and corridors within the urban environment are protected. The McIntyre Creek ecosystem, including its wetlands, are a significant wilderness area in the city, from its headwaters at Mount McIntyre to where it enters the Yukon River. The ecosystem supports populations of mammals, birds and fish and is used by Yukon families for hiking, snowmobiling, fishing, cross-country skiing and birding. McIntyre Creek’s close proximity to Yukon College provides science students opportunity to learn in the field. The creek provides a fishing and hiking experience for tourists who visit Whitehorse. The creek’s enhancement of our quality of life in the city cannot be overestimated.

Will the Yukon government immediately place a moratorium on any development along McIntyre Creek and begin the work of creating a new territorial park?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We’ll certainly work with the city through their official city plan on the future of McIntyre Creek. We’ve done that in the past and we look forward to working with them in the future.

Mr. Hardy: I would like to remind the minister who just stood up that there was a huge list of other organizations who would like to work with the government as well. It is not just a city in this case. I have for tabling the proposal from the Porter Creek Community Association with regard to McIntyre Creek.

Yesterday in paying tribute to Yukon Biodiversity Awareness Month, the minister said, “I encourage all Yukoners to enjoy the world in your own neighbourhhood and celebrate your natural heritage...”

If we don’t protect McIntyre Creek today — and not just a patch here and there but a significant area — we will lose an important part of our natural heritage, one that families from neighbourhoods like Porter Creek, Copper King, Fish Lake Road, McIntyre and Takini have enjoyed for decades.

I was one of those children who did grow up on that creek. The minister has a choice: protect McIntyre Creek and its environments so future generations can enjoy it or sit back and let development consume another wild space in the city. What is the choice of the minister? What is she going to do?
Hon. Ms. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, a key commitment of our government is to enhance the protection, the preservation and the promotion of Yukon’s natural environment.

Mr. Speaker, this government has done very much in terms of protecting various areas throughout the Yukon. In fact, as we speak, there are several planning processes associated with habitat protection area — never mind special management areas pertaining to Kusawa, Agay Mene, as well as others, as we speak.

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite knows full well that the Municipal Act, which is a designated statute that the Yukon Legislature oversees and certainly all municipalities comply with — they are responsible for land use designations. We respect the order of government — all orders of government — including our municipalities. We know that the City of Whitehorse is undertaking an official community planning process. Everyone is encouraged to contribute to that process. We look forward to the outcome of that process. We look forward to working with the City of Whitehorse and all the proponents associated with Friends of McIntyre Creek.

Now in the meantime we would be very pleased to provide — and I know that Department of Environment officials were there last night, as well, providing assistance in that regard.

Question re: School growth planning

Mr. Fairclough: I have a question for the Minister of Education. I understand that the Department of Education is in the process of developing a school growth planning policy. Let me say for the record that the Official Opposition supports the concept of enabling the school community to participate. The process should foster community ownership of school activities and programming.

Can the minister inform the House as to how this process has evolved and who has been consulted regarding this specific piece of policy development?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Upon taking office, this government went to work with our partners in education. We realized there were significant issues, not only in the classrooms in Yukon, but also that parents, community members, First Nation orders of government had with education. We conducted an education reform project; that document has been tabled in this Assembly. We also went to work with the Council of Yukon First Nations on New Horizons, which is our joint method of implementing and addressing the issues that were brought forward.

The school growth planning exercise which, as the member correctly stated, is an excellent way to include parents, school councils, teachers, those affected in a community by education in the planning and growth of a school, is a very good tool for including those people’s perspectives.

We look forward to working with the school growth planning model in our Yukon schools to ensure that the thoughts and feelings of the community are reflected in the school in their neighbourhood.

Mr. Fairclough: This proposed new policy is clearly an example of what is wrong with the minister’s leadership. It takes a system that is 95 percent top-down driven and transforms it into a 99 percent top-down driven one. The proposed changes are insulting to the community that develops them.

For example, under the timing of school growth plans, clause 2 states, and I quote: Annual school growth plans will be submitted for approval to the department by the end of June of each year.

This minister and this government don’t seem to get it. This type of condescending approach to governance will not work.

In the present act, no such permission is required from Big Brother, so will the minister assure Yukoners that this type of regressive, top-down governance will be abandoned?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: I am constantly amazed at the perspective coming from — if it were a Liberal government, the would-be Minister of Education. This is the member opposite who would be the Minister of Education, leading education in this territory, should they have formed government.

The school growth planning exercise has been discussed with school councils, Yukon First Nations, the Council of Yukon First Nations. It is a very progressive way of ensuring the views, thoughts and feelings of a community are reflected in the school.

One of the key points we heard from the education reform exercise was that the community wanted to be involved in the school, and this is an excellent mechanism for doing that. It will engage students, the school councils and people with thoughts and opinions and give them an opportunity to have a say in how their school vision is established. That, in conjunction with the school council and the administration and the teachers, will certainly carry out the desires that Yukoners have for education in their community.

Question re: Watson Lake health centre

Mr. Mitchell: Yesterday, the Premier confirmed that the Yukon Party government plans to spend whatever it takes to complete the construction of a new regional hospital in Watson Lake. With that kind of attitude at the top, it is easy to see why costs get out of hand. While the minister is busy blowing the budget on this project, there are some very important steps that have been forgotten, such as talking to residents about what they think of the new regional hospital.

The Premier has confirmed that it will serve several communities, such as Ross River and Teslin, for example. This will have a big impact on these residents. Why have there not been any discussions with these communities in advance of making this decision?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: What is absolutely astounding is that the Official Opposition simply will not grasp the fact that Watson Lake, as a community, and the surrounding region, since the late 1970s, has had the service of a hospital.

We’ve informed this Leader of the Official Opposition time and time again that, today, the functionality of that facility, that institution, that for decades was providing health care services as a functioning hospital to the community and surrounding area, is now running at a capacity much less than it should. Therefore, the government is taking the appropriate action. In the context of delivering health care for Yukoners, we have made our decision. It’s not about “costing what it
takes to build a building”. This government has demonstrated since coming into office that we will meet the challenges of costs in our health care system, and that’s what we’re doing here, and that’s what we’re doing across the territory, and that’s why the member supported the motion yesterday, Mr. Speaker — so that we can continue to do exactly that.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, if the minister checks the record yesterday, in supporting the motion we pointed out that money was being wasted in this area. It’s another example of poor planning by this Yukon Party government. The construction part of it has been poorly handled, beginning with several contracts handed out to Watson Lake companies with no competitions. This led to higher costs right out of the gate. Halfway through the project, the government changed the scope, and now costs are skyrocketing. It has gone from $5 million to $25 million, or “whatever it costs”, in the Premier’s words.

Now the government is planning to transfer this project to the Yukon Hospital Corporation.

Will the Health and Social Services minister agree to bring officials from the Hospital Corporation before this Assembly on an annual basis so the public can get answers as this project unfolds?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, I’m astounded. The Leader of the Official Opposition has just said that ensuring people who need chemotherapy won’t have to travel to Whitehorse to receive that treatment — they can receive it in the community — is a waste of money.

The member has just said that for seniors, who now can stay in their home community, because we have a hospital that will function at 100-percent of service, instead of having to travel to Whitehorse in their dying days, it is a waste of money. So the people can deliver their children in their home community in a functioning hospital is a waste of money; so that bones can be mended in a functioning hospital in the community is a waste of money —

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: Leader of the Official Opposition, on a point of order.

Mr. Mitchell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don’t think this is just a dispute. The member is putting words in my mouth that he can find nowhere in Hansard. Nowhere have I said these things and to impute that I’m saying these things is directly offending my integrity, and I won’t have it.

Speaker: Government House Leader, on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Cathers: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is simply a dispute among members. The Premier is pointing out his belief in the impact of the action the Leader of the Official Opposition urges.

Speaker’s ruling

Speaker: From the Chair’s perspective, there is a point of order. Because there are strong feelings on each side on this issue, I’d caution the Hon. Premier to be careful with his rhetoric; however, I would also caution the Leader of the Official Opposition: you open a door, things happen.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I will close by saying that this government — this Yukon Party government — will never consider building hospitals, delivering health care, taking care of our citizens as we should as a government, a waste of money.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Party government has badly mishandled this project. It started in 2004 and five years later, it’s nowhere near completed. The Minister of Economic Development had this to say earlier this week: But there’s no excuse for poor planning. Poor planning — I would go for the delay every time over bad planning. We couldn’t agree more. We wish he would share that wisdom with his colleagues over there.

Of course, on this project the Yukon Party has managed to combine both poor planning and long delays. Now the government is trying to send this hot potato to the Yukon Hospital Corporation, so again, will the Health and Social Services minister agree to bring officials from the corporation before this Legislature on an annual basis, as other corporations, so the public can get answers on this project as it unfolds?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I would encourage the member, the Leader of the Official Opposition, to pick up the Yukon Hospital Corporation’s mandate and read it thoroughly, front to back. It’s all about the delivery of health care in this territory; that’s why the government is doing what it’s doing.

The member talks about planning; that’s exactly what the government has done and that is why, since 2002, the Yukon has an increasing population, the Yukon has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, the Yukon has an ever-growing workforce, the Yukon is receiving investment today that no other region in the country has the benefit of. The Yukon is in a strong, healthy financial position. The Yukon is now an attraction internationally. The Yukon has grown in leaps and bounds because of the solid good planning of this Yukon Party government.

Speaker: The time for Question Period has now elapsed. We will proceed to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. McRobb: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I’d like to invite all members to join me in welcoming a constituent and proud member of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, Ms. Sophie Green.

Applause

Hon. Mr. Cathers: 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. Nordick): Order please. Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 15, First Appropriation Act, 2009-10, Vote 7. 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.

Chair’s statement

Chair: Before we proceed with Committee of the Whole, the Chair would like to make a statement about events that occurred in Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, March 31.

During Committee of the Whole on that day, points of order were raised about statements by some members that the speeches offered by other members were a waste of the Committee’s time. Experience has shown that whenever members comment about other members, disorder soon follows. That is what occurred on Tuesday. There was also some conflict between the Chair and a member regarding one of the Chair’s rulings and the member’s reaction to it.

I would remind members that on November 26, 2008, the Speaker met with the three party leaders. The following day, the Speaker gave a statement to the House regarding that meeting. That statement read in part, “the leaders informed the Chair that they had reached a consensus that they, and all members of their respective caucuses, will rededicate themselves to their commitment to raise the level of order and decorum in this House.”

Raising the level of order and decorum in this House requires that members respect each other. They must also respect the Chair, even if they disagree with rulings from the Chair. The Speaker went on to say, “The Chair appreciates the commitment the party leaders are making. On behalf of the Deputy Speaker, the Chair can assure all members that the presiding officers will do their best to apply the House rules knowledgeably, consistently and impartially. The Chair will do its part to ensure that all members act in a manner that respects the institution in which we serve and earns the respect of those we were elected to serve.”

In my rulings and actions on Tuesday, I was, as Chair, attempting to uphold the commitment made by the Speaker and me to help maintain order so that the members can have an orderly and relevant debate, and so that the public interest can be served.

Bill No. 15 — First Appropriation Act, 2009-10 — continued

Department of Economic Development — continued

Chair: We will proceed in Committee of the Whole with general debate on Vote 7, Bill No. 15, First Appropriation Act, 2009-10.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Mr. Chair, we certainly appreciate your comments.

I’d like to go back and go over some of the debate that has happened and also give some new information that we are very proud of.

The Yukon government certainly welcomes the federal contribution to building our Yukon Research Centre of Excellence, which has been announced recently. This is infrastructure that will not only assist Yukoners, but provide the support necessary for the Yukon to contribute to critical national and international science. The INAC minister, Minister Strahl, announced funding for upgrading or replacing Arctic research infrastructure in Yellowknife on March 30 and in Iqualuit on March 31, and has now brought the Yukon into the picture. Of the various funds in the Yukon, five of the funded projects, totalling approximately $13.5 million for upgrading infrastructure located in the Yukon.

Yukon proponents representing government, First Nations and southern research institutes came together and proposed linking the existing and the refurbished science infrastructure into a, quote: hub-and-spoke network based around the centre of excellence that would encourage interdisciplinary and coordinated research by both Yukon and visiting scientists.

Yukon’s network would in turn contribute to larger national and international collaborations. I’d like to give all members some of the information and background on this.

Specifically, the five Yukon-based projects are the Yukon College Northern Research Institute, which is an expansion of the project recently announced by the Yukon government to include heated, unheated and secure storage and additional workspace.

Second, it also addresses the Old Crow research facility, upgrading and new storage and workspace for paleontological collections research and operational equipment utilized by visiting scientists, by Parks Canada and by the Vuntut Gwitchin natural resources department.

Third, the Kluane Lake research station — it will upgrade this station that has hosted nationally and internationally significant science for almost 50 years. The station is owned and operated by the Arctic Institute of North America. I’m pleased to see this one because I have worked with the Arctic Institute now for probably about 25 years, because I had a lot to do working with that group before I even arrived in the Yukon — very closely associated with the University of Calgary and with the University of Toronto.

Fourth, the H.S. Bostock geological core library — expansion and potential relocation of this facility, operated by the Yukon Geological Survey. The core library stores the rapidly increasing reference collection of geological drill cores while providing storage and laboratory space.

Fifth, the Yukon forestry upgrading of the forest branch research greenhouse facilities at the Gunnar Nilsson Mickey Lammers Research Forest and construction of laboratory space at the branch offices. The Arctic research fund was oversubscribed by a ratio of 2:1. Yukon proponents submitted applications for over $28 million in facility upgrades. We were very fortunate to actually get some $13.5 million funded.
Other funded projects are located in all three territories, in Labrador, Quebec and Manitoba.

That is information, again, that I know all members of the House will be interested in and all of Yukon will be interested in. It is, again, addressing diversifying the research and development capability and the scientific capability of Yukon.

There are two other things that I wanted to bring up, Mr. Chair, and it has come up in the debate but it has also come up in articles in the newspaper. They have not been particularly accurate. I think all the media on this is completely wrong. On March 19, it was reported in a one-page article on the 2009-10 budget that the community development fund had been cut from $3.4 million to $3 million. That was printed by one local newspaper, and the other day on March 20, the other newspaper reported that the community development fund had been cut by 11 percent. Both are inaccurate.

The community development fund budget allotment for 2009-10 is $3.3 million, which is exactly the same as the amount approved in the 2008-09 main estimates. Now the community development fund budget is 12-percent lower than the 2008-09 forecast — mainly to revoted items for approved projects that were not complete in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

We do realize that this becomes very difficult for the opposition to understand that you can’t do everything within one fiscal year. Those projects that are underway but not complete that are put into the next year are simply revoted. This is quite different from comparing the main budget to the main budget, which is the way you should of course be doing this.

The primary goal of the community development fund is to fund projects and events that provide long-term sustainable economic or social benefit to Yukon communities. Since reinstatement of the fund in June 2003, after previous governments had tanked it, a total of $16.9 million has been approved.

What is really happening on this is that the articles compared the 2009-10 budget numbers to the 2008-09 forecast figures and not to the 2008-09 main estimates, not to the budget. The forecast traditionally includes revoted projects from the prior year, leaving the reader with the impression that the program has changed when in fact it has not. Forecast figures for 2008-09, Supplementary Estimates No. 2, are $3.7 million. So there is a $429,000 difference, and the forecast figures included revoted amounts outside of the budget or after the budget from previous years of $584,000.

It was also a one-time deduction in 2008-09 in the amount of $155,000 — for those who are following along with their calculators — due to some projects coming in at a lower cost than anticipated. The magnitude, therefore, of the community development fund for 2009-10 is completely unchanged to previous years, and we wanted to correct that.

Unfortunately, the print media decided to continue this, and another one of the local newspapers, on March 20, reported that the strategic industries development fund had been cut by 34 percent. This also is not true. The strategic industries development fund budget allotment for 2009-10 is $1 million, exactly the same as approved in the 2008-09 main estimates — compare mains to mains.

The strategic industries development fund budget is nine-percent lower than the 2008-09 forecast, mainly due to one-time budget increases in 2008-09 and revotes carried forward from 2007-08 to 2008-09. Now, the article also seems to be confusing the strategic industries development program with the strategic industries development fund.

The strategic industries development program includes the strategic industries development fund, the technology partnerships, film and sound incentive programs, and some other projects funded under the northern strategy and targeted investment program.

The 2009-10 budget for the strategic industries development program is down six percent from 2008-09 due to the end of some of the northern strategic funding from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

However, the 2009-10 strategic industries development program budget is 34-percent lower than the 2008-09 forecast due to one-time items in the 2008-09 forecast and revotes. So again, compare main budget to main budget.

When you look at the 2009-10 budget for the strategic industries development program — and it sort of does look like it’s six-percent down due to the end of some of those projects from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, not from YTG — the 2009-10 strategic industries development program budget is 34-percent lower — again, due to one-time items in the forecast and revoted items — $1.225 million one-time funding in the 2008-09 budget, as this was the final year of northern strategy projects. That included e-commerce through CYFN, a project worth $576,000; the Yukon cold climate innovation research project, $649,000; $480,000 was revoted from 2007-08 into 2008-09 and included strategic industries development fund, $168,000; technology innovation centre, $199,000; community access program, $168,000; technology partnerships, $9,000; and the film incentive programs of $26,000. There was also a $70,000 one-time funding in 2008-09 for the community access program directly from Industry Canada, the federal government; and $200,000 in 2008-09 for the completion of the Indian and Northern Affairs targeted investment program support of the Yukon Cold Climate Innovation Centre, with the recruitment of a director and other administrative costs. That doesn’t continue into 2009-10.

So these decreases are partially offset by increases in 2009-10. I know the members opposite will want that information and we’re happy to go into much more detail as we discuss it line by line. There is $40,000 to market the Yukon as a film destination; $560,000, a one-time increase in 2009-10 toward what Yukon spent on the deferred project of Anash and the Legacy of the Sun-Rock, scheduled to film in the Yukon in the summer of 2009; and $70,000, a change in 2009-10 in the strategic industries fund, due to a one-time reduction to the fund in 2008-09 to support the Department of Tourism and Culture and their good initiatives.

Again, I want to put these details out and remind all Yukoners and members opposite you must compare the main budget to the main budget. It makes very little sense and is, in fact, wrong to compare it to cherry-picked amounts during the
year that have been added to or subtracted from by other programs.

With that, we’re very pleased with what we have put on the table, the largest budget in the history of Yukon, and I very much look forward to addressing that in the line by line.

Mr. Hardy: Since we’re talking about mains to mains, it’s interesting — I dug out a budget — capital, O&M, Economic Development — a handout that is given by the department every year in the briefings: 2005-06, just randomly picked a few years ago and there is a comparison there. This is the information that was given to us in 2005-06, comparing to 2009-10. Now, the budget in 2005-06, I believe, was around $700 million. The budget in 2009-10 is $1.3 billion — roughly a $300-million increase. That is a substantial increase in a very short period of time.

So I thought that I would take a look at Economic Development and see if they have also grown along with the size of the budget. Interestingly enough, they haven’t. I have been under the impression that Economic Development was one of the mainstays of this government — and diversification. So my questions may be slightly different from those of the Official Opposition. There is a different type of comparison here.

I’ll go through an example. I’ll go through one by one because I know the minister, when in debate a few days ago, indicated that he did not like the multitude of questions coming at him from the Official Opposition, so I’ll try to do it piece by piece.

Let’s take a look at the business incentive program. My figures here have — pardon me, I’ll back up for a second. I’m looking at the capital at this present time. My figures here — total capital in 2005-06 was $9,369,000. This might be a little bit hard on the deputy minister and assistant. I’m sure they didn’t bring the 2005-06 books with them. So, I’ll try to give as much information as I can.

The total capital was $9,369,000. The total capital for 2009-10 was $9,091,000, so there was actually a decrease in spending, yet there is a $300-million increase in the overall budget.

Now these are their figures; this is all we have to go on. So let’s look at the business incentive policy, as it’s one of the incentive programs that I was very much involved in many, many years ago, and have always kept a mild interest in it.

In 2005-06, there was $1,109,000 in the budget for the business incentive policy — BIP, as people call it. This year, the handout we got is $984,000. That is a decrease. Can the minister explain the decrease?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: For the member opposite, there are a variety of different factors that come into play here, and I do appreciate the Leader of the Third Party asking a question, getting an answer. I do get frustrated sometimes with the Liberal critic, who will ask 10 questions and, no matter how many you answer, he’ll always be able to complain that you didn’t answer one of them, so I think this is a much better way.

There are a variety of different things, as I say, that affect this, not the least of which is we were a new department, even back in 2005, after the short-lived Liberal government for some reason — which none of us have ever been able to understand — decided that the best way to promote economic development was to do away with the Department of Economic Development; the best way to promote tourism was to do away with the Department of Tourism.

So we were new; we were getting started; we weren’t up to complete speed at that point. Also, as that developed, the rail study certainly impacted in there at the time; we had the development of the aquatic centre; we had the development of the athletes village; we had a number of big projects that were active at that point in time.

At the same time now, we have an influx of community infrastructure funds that are coming in and other funding procedures. But I think the two things that I really want to stress on this for the member opposite is that the business incentive policy — or BIP, as it’s affectionately known — is driven by applications. It’s people who apply for it. It’s not something that we can say we’re going to put X dollars in. We pick a number that we think is going to be realistic — and it will adjust later up or down — but in general, it depends on who applies for it and who wants to utilize it.

I think the other thing is to maybe see where the question is going on BIP. BIP, or the business incentive policy, is specifically exempted from the Agreement on Internal Trade. Do we run into the potential of problems with the Agreement on Internal Trade on the surface? Yes. But that is a negotiated exemption and has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Hardy: We’ll get to the Agreement on Internal Trade soon.

I guess in a very short answer, which we are all challenged to deliver — just as a short question that we are still challenged on this side to ask — the forecast is that there will be fewer applications.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Basically, the trend has been down so that is where we are going with that. Again, it is aimed at those we expect to apply to it. It is not what we are saying that this is exactly what we’re going to put into it.

Mr. Hardy: I’m just going down the list here to make sure that I compare apples to apples and oranges to oranges.

One of my favourites, since I was very much involved — there it is — in getting it brought forward under the NDP government was the microloan program, which is administered by Dana Naye Ventures for low-dollar-value loans — $2,000 and stuff like that. In 2005-06, there was $98,000 put into that program. This year, there is $73,000. Again, what is the rationale around that one?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: This is actually a very, very good program. We’re very happy with it. The uptake has decreased a little bit. We also have other programs that have jumped in to fill the void, so that we’re not as dependent on that program. It is, to a degree, self-sustaining — what goes in comes back out. It was established in March 2000, so it would have been toward the end there of the NDP government. The member is quite correct.

It’s also in conjunction with Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, or INAC, and Dana Naye. It looks at a total of 96 loans, valued at $288,342, which were distributed. The maximum initial loan is $2,000, and may increase as high as $8,000...
as credit is established. For the member opposite, the value of the loans outstanding right now is about $36,874.38, approximately. The default rate since inception, interestingly, has been 12 percent, so it’s a bit more of a risk, but very, very worthwhile. As we know, especially for someone of very limited means, sometimes that little tiny loan will get them going into a small business. It’s as useful here as it is in the Third World.

I notice that there is — I think it’s through eBay, of all places — they have a microloan program going where you can invest small amounts of money into the Third World for small businesses and actually get a small return, but it’s all put out in anywhere from $500 to $2,000 or $3,000 at a time — a very, very valuable and useful program.

Mr. Hardy: I agree with the minister opposite that it’s very valuable and, to tell you the truth, the inspiration for this — I got the inspiration from the cooperatives that have been started in India. It was basically women in villages who had no opportunities and no income. They created their own banking system and loan system, basically. A lot of it was around textiles and being able to buy sewing machines and equipment like that that only cost a couple of thousand bucks, but they would never have been able to afford it by themselves. That was basically the start of the idea of the microloans — I think around the world, really in that sense — it was people coming together.

The minister is right that the loans are so small that even if the risk is — even if the default is 12 percent, it’s not a big amount. I mean, it’s something that you are still not going to shy away from doing, because the success rate is so good, when you see somebody who has so very little, able to start up their own little business and actually start contributing to the economy, instead of feeling like they at times are a burden to it.

I’ll continue, because there’s a trend here unfortunately. I just need some clarification. Maybe it’s a reflection of our economy, the forecast of where we’re going with the economics around the world and what has been happening, but I think it’s important just to point out the changes.

Enterprise trade fund — there was a million dollars put into it in 2005-06; today there’s only $400,000. I’m sure there’s a good explanation for that.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: I’m just checking my facts. The enterprise trade fund is another one that is applicant-driven; in other words, we respond to who applies for it and, as fewer people apply, the amount of money necessary to run it goes down. However, we have diverted that money into marketing initiatives and training initiatives, so it’s popping up in other parts of the budget. Again, would we increase that as time goes on during the year if the applicants and need are there? I would certainly look at going back to that but, right now, it’s applicant-driven and we’re looking at a historical trend for the applicants going down in that.

Mr. Hardy: That surprises me because it’s the provision of export marketing and business development support for small- and medium-sized businesses. I know this minister has been very active in trying to promote the small- and medium-sized businesses on many of the trips he takes. I’m surprised there isn’t that much uptake on it, really. It is surprising; maybe it needs to be marketed better. Please, we’ve got money — please apply. Okay — people must be doing well.

Regional economic development fund — you know what I should have done is just copied this and then I could have just handed it over to you guys. Regional economic development fund — this year, $450,000, and three years ago it was $500,000. So there has been a slight decrease and it facilitates and supports First Nations in regional economic development through planning and capacity development initiatives. I would assume that has got to be an ongoing challenge and project because it is about economic development.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Yes, the member opposite, actually in his speculation there, comes up with a rather interesting one. With, for instance, the community development fund, in the beginning at one point with so many of the large funds coming available, we saw actually quite a decrease in the number of applicants. So I found myself going out and saying exactly that: Please, we’ve got money. Apply. Let’s get some projects going here. Let’s get some things happening.

Well, guess what? Some of the larger projects ended, the pendulum shifted and all of a sudden we had $3-million worth of applicants for $1-million worth of funds and suddenly we’re being a little more critical toward some of the people we had actually invited to apply. So it’s a good example of “Be careful of what you wish for; you just might get it.”

The regional economic development fund — again, it is coordinating regional economic development, just as it says. In 2008-09, $479,000 was approved for 24 projects throughout Yukon. Overall, since 2004-05, we’ve put in $1.58 million in 80 Yukon projects.

It covers First Nations and municipal governments. It covers development agencies, community associations, Yukon businesses, business-related organizations. It really covers quite a wide range of things. Basically, maximum funding, or eligible funding for a single application, is $50,000, with no more than 75 percent coming from Yukon government sources and at least a 15-percent cash equity contribution of the total project cost from the proponent. So, right now, the fund is set at $450,000. Again, historically applicant-driven, we think that’s basically what we’re going to be getting.

It addresses, really, the needs of the First Nations through other funds and strategic industries and individual projects, mining reviews, et cetera. So, again, it’s not a single fund that’s looking at this. It’s something that is available, but it’s part of the puzzle, and in a wide variety of other funds. Even the enterprise trade fund, which, I agree with the member opposite, could be used in many more ways — and having said that, I’ll probably regret it when the applications start coming in — but I don’t see that as a problem. We’re happy to review them.

Mr. Hardy: Well, maybe in my next life I’ll apply.

Moving down to one of my favourites of all time: the community development fund. The minister has already talked about the community development fund and how important it is to compare mains to mains, and I understand that. I was in government over here. I also know the community development fund, of course, was one of the prouder achievements, I think, of the NDP many years ago, which has been supported by the
Yukon Party and enhanced in some ways. It definitely wasn’t favoured by the Liberal government of the day, and the minister’s very correct: the Liberal government did target a lot of initiatives that, I think, were driven by a dislike for the NDP, frankly, because they really targeted a lot of them — which is a shame, because it didn’t serve the people of this territory, and you’re elected to serve the people, your party, and not your own political ambitions.

So let’s compare, though: community development fund, $3,523,000 in 2005-06, and as has already been said, community development fund 2009-10, $3,300,000. I would assume that, because we’re trying to create more opportunities for work for people to try to head off some of the economic impacts this downturn may have, I would have hoped to see maybe a little bit more money put into this fund. It does employ a lot of people throughout the Yukon.

**Hon. Mr. Kenyon:** The community development fund is one of my favourites too, because you can do so much with it in such a wide range of areas. It has remained at $3.3 million. As I mentioned before — and I won’t go back into that detail — it goes up and down with what can be completed and not completed and sloughs into another year and all the rest. On paper it seems to wander a little bit, but the reality is that it basically sticks around that $3.3-million mark.

It allows us to do everything from the so-called tier 1, which is under $20,000; tier 2, which is $20,000 to $70,000; and then tier 3, which we met on today and which is above that $70,000 — and the announcements will come out soon on that.

But when you look back at some of the things we’ve been able to do — we’ve been able to support NGOs, support communities; do little greenhouse projects that not only would create work to put it up and maintain it, but to provide food, exercise and everything else for the various communities.

I had the great honour last week — last Friday — of going up to Pelly and looking at not only celebrating their major efforts up there, but to go around town and look at the various things that the CDF has done there, specifically in terms of community beautification. It is on the highway and it’s part of our tourism. We’re very happy to support that, to be able to drive around and just see the difference that has made within Pelly in the last year. That’s just simply one of many of the projects.

As I say again, it is applicant-driven. Some years we’re looking for places where we can put it and some years we have more people than not. But I am pleased to report that, overall, anything worthwhile that we’ve had to put off, we have been able to get it on a slightly adjusted schedule and get it back on track the next intake.

We have been pretty fortunate to do that and we do encourage — all joking aside — people to come to CDF and look at it. I know in my own riding, through CDF, we developed trails all over the territory and the residents of Crestview were very interested in getting a trail set up that would get the kids off the Alaska Highway when going to school and to their friends. Because it is the Alaska Highway, it is a little difficult to say that you’re going to tunnel under it or bridge over it, but we can, through CDF, do that and that is what we’re doing now.

There is a wide variety of projects. I noticed the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin was interested in one project. One of the things that we’ve done up there is a gazebo for the elders. We’ve looked at setting up some of the trails and doing it when the ground is still frozen so people don’t have to go out and sort of swim on these trails or go out and disrupt skiing. There are all sorts of things that can be done within that. One thing I noticed was a growing number of very small one-day projects coming out of Old Crow. I asked staff to go up and meet with the people in Old Crow and come up with some ideas of something that would be larger — let’s spend more money there, but let’s do it in something that is going to be sustainable. So there are all sorts of different things that you can utilize the CDF for.

It’s my favourite too, I have to admit.

**Mr. Hardy:** If there were a huge uptake in the community development fund that goes beyond $3.3 million, you could anticipate having a supplementary brought in with an increase in it?

**Hon. Mr. Kenyon:** Anything is possible. We respond to demonstrated need; that has been the principle of this government since 2002.

**Mr. Hardy:** Okay, we won’t go there, though. I’m trying to keep a very civil — not even trying; it’s easy to be civil.

Strategic industries and project development program — we’re getting close to the end of this, don’t worry — 2009-10, $1 million. Four years ago, it was $1.5 million. That’s a substantial decrease; could the minister explain that, please?

**Hon. Mr. Kenyon:** Again, just checking to make sure I’m on the right track here. What has happened on this is, in the early days when the Department of Economic Development rose back out of the ashes, after that short period of 22 months in the early part of the decade, we did have a larger original budget — the member is quite right about that — because we had to estimate the need. Where exactly were we going to go with this? We funded a lot of different studies out of that — significant sector studies. Now we’re starting to focus on the projects that came out of those studies. So then we were planning what we were going to do, and while there still is a lot of planning going on, it’s not as much. What we’re doing now is getting ahead and doing it.

**Mr. Hardy:** Okay, technology partnerships. There’s a decrease in that one as well — $250,000 four years ago, $217,000 this year. Can I have an explanation around that?

**Hon. Mr. Kenyon:** Again, in the early days of doing the studies and coming up with what had to be done, what needed to be done — the needs have focused more. We’re working more on the quality end of it now, looking at the most likely projects and how we’re going to develop those, so the need for the money is a little bit less. But, again, it is applicant-driven, to a large degree, because of what’s happening out there. If something comes up where we have to increase it, we will. But at the moment that’s dealing with where we want to go on the individual projects, the main research having been done.
Mr. Hardy: Now, there is an increase because I had a clue there — not that I’m picking on the minister. But when I read it closer, I realized the increase was very small, after I took out one initiative — one stand-alone initiative, so it won’t be there again — and that is the film and sound incentive program.

There are six funds there. It’s $1.36 million this year. It was only $715,000 in 2005-06. But there is, in the detail from the department — which I appreciate — a one-time amount of $560,000 to support the film production of *Anash and the Legacy of the Sun-Rock*. I hope we get to see it up here. Sometimes you don’t get to see these movies. I know one movie done by a First Nation woman is a very popular movie in France, but it has never been shown in the Yukon. It tours all over France and she still gets invited back to the showings of it. But as far as I know, I don’t think it has ever been shown in the Yukon.

However, putting that aside, when you take that out, the increase in four years has only been approximately $85,000, really. I really like the support that goes into this investment. I know when you compare it to our competition Outside, it’s so small, with the subsidies and the amount of monies they can put toward their film and sound incentive programs. But is this small amount of increase over four years really, other than the special project — the stand-alone one — is it just because there hasn’t been an overall growth in that area and an increase or do you just feel that solves needs right now and that’s where you’re just holding it?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Yes, the member is right in his assumptions on that. First of all, it’s demand-driven and it’s an industry that has been very severely challenged throughout Canada — a variation in everything from the Canadian dollar to when it came up to par and it sort of torpedoed an awful lot of projects, et cetera.

We are seeing a little bit of a better response now that the Canadian and American dollars have sort of separated. It is demand-driven.

*Anash and the Legacy of the Sun-Rock* — I have notes and everything else that it is “Annish” and “Anishi”; however, our Minister of Justice, who is a speaker of the language, tells me that it is “Anash.” So, who knows? Who knows? It did show up here. It was on APTN. I managed to tape a good chunk of it. Unfortunately, the taping that I did was at 5:00 in the morning and then I found out that it was on later, so I kind of lost on that.

*Anash* has been approved for another $560,000 in production funding for an additional seven episodes. So if the member missed the first, he will see the others. I may actually have a copy of that sitting around; I’ll check and if I can find one, I will get it to him. That is a $2.8-million project and they will start filming in Yukon in 2009.

The Film and Sound Commission, for such a small, little group has done such an incredible job over the time. I don’t think people quite realize that *Anash and the Legacy of the Sun-Rock* was filmed at the Yukon Convention Centre. It was filmed in what they call “green screen” and I was very honoured to be there for some of the filming. In other words, everything was painted green. It was done up with plywood boxes and everything else. It was all filmed on to something — at the time, two years ago it was massive; I think it was something like four terabyte hard drives which went out by air every day and then it was animated in the background. It’s a combination of live and animation. This is something that is quite unique really in the film industry. It’s interesting to see that first of all the animation capital of the world is really in Canada, but doing this combined thing by Carol Geddes — the very talented Yukon filmmaker whom I just have had a ball watching — it has led the way.

The $40,000 increase that we put in there has been for marketing and we have jockeyed around the various programs. There’s the film location incentive, film training initiative, filmmakers fund, film development fund, film production fund, as well as the sound recording program. It also has been funded in a number of other ways, such as the community development fund, because the film association wanted to have some of the basic equipment on-site.

This is one of the challenges: if someone calls and says, “We’d like to produce a commercial,” or “We’d like to do a movie or something, in the Yukon — do you have people trained?” That’s the first thing. Yes, we do, because we’ve had training programs. Do you have the equipment? Well, the huge, very expensive cameras and such — no. But do we have all the equipment attendant to that? Now we do, through the community development fund.

We put on a program of doing a couple of short films, brought up one of these incredibly expensive high-end cameras and a couple of people to operate it, and invited all of the people to come in as a training exercise. Again, I was invited to go out there, and here’s 45 Yukoners running around with the little clapperboards and boom microphones and everything else, and by the time they finished these little films, it wasn’t what came out the other end; it was the fact that Yukoners now know how to use this equipment and they have the equipment on-site. Again, to do that with our little Yukon group is quite impressive.

The other part that sometimes, again, we’ll put this in through enterprise trade, again, we have the ability to do what’s referred to as familiarization tours, or “fam tours.” I was invited one night by the company, actually, to join them for dinner when they came up to look at locations, and the director cornered me and was very insistent: “We are here because of that familiarization tour. We are not here considering Yukon as a location; we’re here to pick out where in Yukon we are going and who in the Yukon we’re going to hire to do it.”

Again, a small investment of a different fund and it comes into here. Again, we respond to the demonstrated needs that are essential. The extra $40,000 that member referred to is actually in marketing fund.

Mr. Hardy: Thank you. Yes, I am fairly familiar with the industry, not as a person who practices or makes a living at it but just, over the years, watching it grow and knowing many people who have tried to do films and the phenomenal expense to do a film. It is just staggering. I have watched people mortgage their homes to do a dream in many ways. It really is staggering. It is so much easier to cut a CD — so much easier.
Somebody many argue, but I’m sorry, I have watched the equipment that is necessary and it is good that the government continues to buy equipment because, frankly, it wouldn’t happen unless it was government-subsidized in that area. I am glad to see that.

I guess on the bottom line, when I add it all up — and that is the last of this for you, so don’t worry — is that there is almost a $200,000 drop from 2005-06 to 2009-10. That worries me because I believe that the Economic Development department should really be getting far greater assistance and should be doing a heck of a lot more work with more money and maybe needs a better lobbying effort. Maybe the minister needs to lobby the Premier, the Finance minister, a little bit better in ensuring that this department has a chance to grow.

I do remember when we were in government and our Economic Development minister often trying to champion the cause for more money into this department. I hope that the minister takes that as just friendly advice to fight a little bit harder at the Cabinet table for a bit more money in this area.

The minister mentioned the AIT and the changes that are being made in there. Some people call them TILMA — TILMA changes within the AIT — that’s the Agreement on Internal Trade. It’s being expanded. I have definitely a different opinion on it and the minister very well knows my concerns around TILMA. But I also have a legal opinion here that came out very recently with regard to Canada’s internal free trade agenda. It does challenge very much some of the statements that the minister has made. I would like to read a little bit to him and get his opinions on that.

Now this is a very respected law firm that has taken a look at changes in the language that’s being brought forward and the reasons around it.

I’ll just read a little bit of that. It says: Federal and provincial trade ministers have recently signed agreements on dispute resolution and labour mobility. An energy agreement is pending. The Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement — TILMA — formally goes into effect between Alberta and British Columbia on April 1, 2009.

So that specific agreement that we’ve heard so much about just went into effect yesterday.

Now it goes on: The impact of these domestic trade initiatives will be broad and often incompatible with other societal goals, from stimulating local economies and maintaining a universal health care system, to protecting the environment. Yet this internal trade agenda is proceeding with very little transparency and virtually no public debate. In reality, there are a few barriers to interprovincial trade, investment and labour mobility. As we know, Canadians are free to live, work and invest anywhere in this country they choose. There are no customs stations along provincial borders and no tariffs on interprovincial trade. Rather, the true purpose of this domestic trade agenda is to impose broad constraints on the exercise of government and public authority under the rubric of addressing trade barriers. At its core, this is an agenda to promote further privatization and deregulation, precisely the policies that have been ruinous for domestic and global economies and also have frustrated efforts to deal with pressing environmental challenges such as climate change.

A pretty strong statement by this group of lawyers — can the minister respond to that?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Yes, without knowing who the lawyers are, what the nature of the question was, and without even going near the rules of the House that say that you shouldn’t be asking an opinion, I’d certainly deal with it, because what the member is reading is, in many cases, completely wrong.

When the member refers to things such as health care and First Nations and these sorts of things, they’re exempt. I can speak to the Agreement on Internal Trade. As the member quite well knows, we are not signed on to TILMA; we have made the decision that we would not. We wanted to do that with facts, not with rhetoric, and so we took our time. The good staff of the Department of Economic Development and other departments went through that with a fine-tooth comb and found that there was absolutely nothing in TILMA that we couldn’t do with the existing Agreement on Internal Trade.

It is a national agreement, for those who aren’t familiar with it. We work with our federal, provincial, and territorial counterparts to reduce the barriers to trade, and when the member opposite’s document says that there are few barriers, I just wonder what country they’re living in. I’m suspicious it’s not Canada.

There are a number of restrictions and a number of barriers. There are a number of problems, from professions or trades that are certified in one jurisdiction but not in the other.

The social union framework agreement, or SUFA, does say that you have a right to work anywhere, but it doesn’t say that you have a right to practice your trade or practice your profession. You can’t just simply move from one place to another. I think if people look at the multiple licence plates and permit plates on a transport truck as they come along the line, as they go from one province or territory to another and are subject to different restrictions — I’m not in the trucking industry, but certainly the people I talk to are very frustrated with that.

What the Agreement on Internal Trade does — and we were really pushed along harder on this in August of 2007, when the Council of the Federation, or COF, as it’s affectionately known, which is a meeting of premiers, reaffirmed the importance of internal trade to the Canadian economy and agreed on a five-point action plan to really push this along. Several premiers were very central to that discussion, not the least of whom was the Premier of Quebec and the Premier of British Columbia, who, interestingly enough, was one of the two TILMA designates.

At the time, we were instructed to move ahead on the dispute resolution mechanism, and that particular chapter alone — in my opinion and in the opinion of many of the other trade ministers — was responsible for creating TILMA. There was no effective dispute resolution mechanism up until yesterday, interestingly. It was left, really, to never-never land, in terms of how to do it. If there was a dispute mechanism or dispute thing — and we do have a dispute panel in Yukon; we have people
appointed to that. I’m not sure they’ve ever had to meet, but they’re there and named, if they did have to. But there was no mechanism to settle it out, so if one jurisdiction lost that dispute, there was nothing to say that they actually had to do what the dispute resolution mechanism said.

The most famous of that was on the production of margarine, which looked an awful lot like butter. One jurisdiction — without naming it — basically said, “Well, you’ve got to colour it in some way to make it a distinctive product, other than the butter we produce.” Many people referred to that affectionately as the blue butter or blue margarine fiasco. But once the ruling was made, nobody had to do anything about it. That just sat on the books for years and years and years.

We now had the direction from the Council of the Federation to come up with a dispute resolution mechanism that would make sense. At a meeting in Vancouver last year, under the Chair of the Minister of Trade for British Columbia, all jurisdictions with the exception of one agreed to that mechanism. They promptly handed the gavel over to me and wished me luck, so that was a rather interesting afternoon.

But through a little backroom explaining and the good work of our officials, by the end of the year, the Province of Ontario signed on to it and we now have full agreement on dispute resolution, so that is going ahead.

Again, I think for anyone to say that there are few trade barriers or restrictions, I think is working really without all of the facts. I’ll give the member opposite an example — a Yukon so-called example — of the degree of frustration in this whole situation. A number of years ago a young child was attacked by dogs in the Village of Atlin, and I believe was killed. The results of the British Columbia’s coroner’s jury was that they had to institute a spay/neuter program.

Whitehorse veterinarians were more than happy to go down and do this. The First Nation was interesting in participating, et cetera. The British Columbia Veterinarian Medical Association answered that if any Yukon veterinarian goes in there they will be charged with practising without a licence. It had to be a British Columbia veterinarian, but none were interested in going. In fact, that spay/neuter program was never conducted and the problem was never resolved.

Today, if you are licensed in one jurisdiction, you are able to practice in others. If you are a red seal in sheet metal or carpentry you can go to any other jurisdiction and practice. There are ways that you can work that. Every jurisdiction has — it is not, as some people would say, the race to the bottom. In fact, it is going to be the race to the top because you are still competing for the same jobs, and boy we can get into that one. But it really means that you can work anywhere and it’s good. While it may have some challenges for people coming into one jurisdiction, it is also great because people here, for instance, can go down into British Columbia or down in Manitoba and can go into other provinces to do some degree of work. It gives mobility as a Canadian. I think it is a good thing. We are working on the energy chapter. We are trying to complete the agricultural chapter, and these are individual parts of the agreement, and to try to harmonize the regulations and standards to the best available and the best practices.

Parties continue to work to implement the Premier’s direction on that. We are in the process right now in ratifying the revised dispute resolution and labour mobility chapters.

I was very pleased to be invited down to British Columbia a few weeks ago for the tabling of the Labour Mobility Act, and we’ll see where that goes in their Legislature. In terms of the member’s previous comments, too, on the budget, that’s the one department I think that I have had very good luck on, and while there has been some push through some departments to cut or pull back on the Economic Development budget, I’m very pleased to report to him that I haven’t had to work hard to convince the Premier to keep the budget where it is or to increase it where necessary. I’ve had excellent, excellent support in that respect, and I’m very happy to admit it.

Mr. Hardy: Well, that was a very long answer. Obviously we have differences of opinion, and I think time will prove one of us right in this regard, because I can assure you, I’ve worked all over Canada with my red seal, and I was never denied anywhere. Never. Under the Constitution, I was always welcome, and worked in four provinces and two territories.

I know, for instance, when I was a union representative, I sent many workers to other provinces and territories, and they were never ever denied access to jobs there. I know the current business agent for plumbers and pipefitters and sheet metal workers has been sending many, many apprentices to Alberta to work, to British Columbia to work, to Saskatchewan to work — and no roadblocks whatsoever. So that’s a red herring. I’m sorry; people could work anywhere they wanted, and if they were denied, they had the right to challenge that.

Again, you know, it’s my own experience as well as that of many, many people with whom I worked across country as a business agent for four unions. I found that there were never roadblocks in that area.

One of the other concerns, of course, is the direction the government is going in, and what it could leave itself open to. I’m not going to spend a lot of time on this. I think we have a difference of opinions in this matter.

Right now, before Canada, under the NAFTA regime, which has similar kinds of dispute resolutions and the rights for businesses that feel that they have been denied an opportunity to compete fairly in any of the — on an international level to seek retribution through the regime that was created under NAFTA, AIT would have kind of a similar structure. I’ll give you a few examples of what has been happening with the claims that are before the federal government. Centurion Health Corporation — a U.S. health service provider — $160 million in damages they claimed to have suffered in consequence of being denied the right to establish a chain of private health clinics in Canada. Give me a break — that’s insanity.

Dow AgroSciences — $2 million in damages which it claims it has suffered as a consequence of a ban on the use of certain pesticides by Quebec. Well, doesn’t the province have a right to say that pesticides are not good for the people? No, they’re going to get sued; they are being sued.

Crompton-Chemtura Corporation, a U.S. pesticides manufacturer — $83 million in damages arising from a Canadian restriction on the use of lindane, a pesticide — $83 million in
damages. Who the heck are these corporations that can tell governments and people what poisons they can put into their soil? When they say, “No, we’re not going to have that,” they get sued.

Merrill and Ring, a U.S.-owned forest company that has been operating in Canada for decades — $24 million in damages it claimed to have suffered in consequence of having to supply Canadian markets before exporting raw logs to the U.S., and along with them, the jobs that go with value-added processing. Value added — that means employment there. They’re shipping raw logs out to do the processing in the States — raw logs that come from Canada, come from that province, and the province that does need that kind of investment.

Ah yes, Abitibi-Bowater, which is now threatening to challenge Newfoundland’s decision to reclaim a water licence it issued to the company for the purpose of powering a pulp and paper mill and which the company now wants to sell, because it has closed the mill. We all know about that one because the premier there has stood up to them and said, “Absolutely no way. You’re not taking jobs, shutting down industry here,” especially a profitable mill — and it was a profitable mill — and then selling the rights — our rights — out from underneath us and still making money.

Unfortunately, TILMA was modelled after that kind of stuff that we’re witnessing now under NAFTA.

The changes that are encroaching into the AIT are just the first step. I am not going to go through this. If the minister wants, I will make a copy of this for him and send it over.

**Some Hon. Member:** (Inaudible)

**Mr. Hardy:** Yes. Okay? Not a problem. I won’t go on about it, because I think we can go back and forth and just end up agreeing to disagree, ultimately. I want the minister to know that there are different opinions, and I definitely have one of them.

Can the minister tell me what adjustments have been made in regard to *Pathways to Prosperity: an Economic Growth Perspective, 2005-2025*? I think it was put out in 2004 or 2005, around the same time frame I was talking about when I was going through all those initiatives that are in this department. There was, basically, a recognition that the government was going to work on an economy that was less dependent on federal transfer payments and what it will need to do to capture external wealth. They listed the very sources that it would come from: film industry, exports, mining and tourism. And they had anticipated — just looking at this quickly — that government’s projected relative contribution to Yukon’s GDP in 2004 was — the government’s contribution, just to make sure that is clear — 40 percent. By the year 2025, it was supposed to go down to 26 percent. Yet my understanding is that it is up in the 60s at this present time. Since this report came out somewhere around 2004 or 2005, instead of working toward the 26-percent reduction on the government contribution to the GDP, we have actually increased our contribution to the GDP and in many ways, the diversification of the economy — which we all wish to see up here — has actually lessened over the last few years. Can the minister respond to that, please?

**Hon. Mr. Kenyon:** One of the things, again, that we get into is the old apples-to-oranges debate on that. I can’t really compare or talk about the statistics. I can’t really talk about the statistics that were there, because I’m not really sure what the member opposite is comparing.

Yes, the *Agreement on Internal Trade* — I think we’ll always disagree with a bit. I appreciate the member opposite saying he could work anywhere in Canada. I couldn’t. I’m licensed in the Province of Ontario; I can practise in the Yukon; I’m licensed in the Northwest Territories; I’m licensed in the United Kingdom, and in every country of the European economic community, but I couldn’t go to Atlin and spay a dog — until April 1, until yesterday.

I know of a pharmacist up here — a very skilled pharmacist who is licensed in Ontario — and can’t work in the Yukon.

So there are a number of trade barriers there. According to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Internal Trade, or DFAIT, as recently as a couple of days ago, the number one concern of various jurisdictions and people and governments looking at investing into Canada is internal trade barriers, so that’s something we do have to continue to work on.

The member’s right; in some areas, that’s not a great concern, but in many areas, it is and our job is to look at all of those possibilities. The other thing that always gets very frustrating to deal with is, again, the fact of saying that there is little diversification in the Yukon. I would really beg to differ on that.

We do have some of the statistics — for instance, let’s look at the 2007 real GDP by industry. When you look at finance and insurance, real estate, renting and leasing, management of companies, enterprises — 18 percent of the economy; construction, 11 percent; health care and social assistance, nine percent; public administration, 22 percent; arts, entertainment and recreation, one percent — but when you put that in perspective, the Yukon spends something like 10 times the national average in sports, culture and recreation. We’re proud of that, and I think all of us are proud of that. The opportunities we have up here are really quite amazing.

Educational services, six percent; retail trade, five percent — when you get down to mining and oil and gas extraction, four percent of the GDP by industry comes out of mining and oil and gas extraction; accommodation and food services, four percent; information and cultural industries, three percent. Interestingly, when you get down to manufacturing, it is only one percent, which again, do we have some manufacturing here? Yes, we do, but we aren’t in the league of Ontario and Quebec. Again, the harbingers of good news — we look at the news at the end of the night and say, “Gee, the economy is so terrible.” They’re looking at the layoffs in the aircraft and automobile industries. At least, at this point, I don’t think we make any cars or aircraft.

General utilities — two percent of the GDP comes out of that; transportation and warehousing — three percent; wholesale trade — three percent.

On the information and cultural industries — on information, anyway, we mentioned three percent. We have the best penetration of the Internet, certainly in Canada and probably in
the world. I was sitting at a meeting of ministers of information technology, and I referred to the fact that we have a penetration of over 99 percent of people who wish to get connected to high-speed Internet who have the opportunity, and compare that to 61 percent in Ontario. The Ontario minister sort of lifted right out of his seat and pointed out that they’ve been working very hard at that and were, in fact, up to 64 percent. We’re at 99 percent.

So we do have a diversification in there, and the diversification will continue to go, but we still have to understand the fact that this is a resource-rich area.

That’s what we’ve got. The Pathways to Prosperity document, I think, was a good document to really show how close we are to Asia and what is available to us there and what we should be concentrating on and looking at.

We have to be careful with those statistics, Mr. Chair. For instance the Official Opposition awhile back referred to the fact that there was a 200-percent increase in the Yukon of bankruptcies. What they failed to mention was that there was one in the previous time that they compared and there were three in the time after. So they concluded that was a 200-percent increase. Well, that is kind of ridiculous isn’t it, in terms of making that kind of comparison?

The other part of the comparison, too, is that some of the statistics that we get refer to public sector versus private sector jobs, forgetting the fact that public sector also includes the First Nations. We have multiple orders of government. Since 2003 — and to a degree before — but since 2003, as First Nations come on board and form their own governments, their employees are, in fact, considered public sector — as are hospitals, as are schools, as is Yukon College. So you get a very artificial look at that statistic. I just caution the member opposite to, again, compare apples to apples and leave turnips out of the matrix.

Mr. Cardiff: I just have a few questions for the minister. I would like to revisit some of what he said. My colleague, the Member for Whitehorse Centre, is talking about the Agreement on Internal Trade and the minister talked about the fact that, if you have an interprovincial standard red seal, there is labour mobility and that is a good thing, and the fact that, in some professions, you didn’t have that labour mobility.

I guess what the concern is and maybe the minister — if he can’t provide the information today or if he can provide documentation in the future, it would be much appreciated. There is a concern in some areas where some provinces are not doing the same training.

The trades training that’s available for some trades is not up to the same standard as it is in other jurisdictions and, consequently, the trade certificates that you receive, the qualifications that you receive, aren’t at the same level as in some other jurisdictions. It’s what’s known as modular training, or specialization, so, there’s a concern out there by tradespeople and organizations that represent tradespeople that it is a race to the bottom, because the bar gets set lower. If you come from a jurisdiction where the training that you receive in that trade or occupation is not the same level as you would receive in the Yukon — because what we’re talking about is the Yukon — there is the potential for people to come here with less qualification and work in those professions and take jobs away from people who live here, who have been trained to a higher standard.

I guess one of my concerns is about public safety. Some of these occupations and industries — we’re talking about building public infrastructure. You know, it could be working on buildings; it could be assembling pipelines; it could be welding; it could be any number of occupations; but if the standard is lower, but labour mobility is guaranteed — so what I’m asking the minister is this: what types of guarantees are there in the Agreement on Internal Trade that guarantees that the highest standard will be maintained when it comes to trade qualifications or professional qualifications? That’s my question for the minister.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: I can understand some of the member’s concerns on that. What the Agreement on Internal Trade says is that that person would have the right to work there.

It doesn’t necessarily reflect on who, for instance, is a contractor, if the member were a contractor. It says that they can’t deny the job to someone with that certification from another jurisdiction, but they can certainly hire the best person available, and the best person available may well not be from that jurisdiction. It also means that these people may need additional training, and one of the emphases of our government is certainly on training. While we fund some into programs on that, I’ll let the Minister of Education deal with that more directly.

The other thing is that one of the real standards on this and the way it’s starting to move now — as the current chair, it is something I’ll certainly push on future chairs — is that we have to harmonize those regulations, and that’s where the member is perfectly right on. The harmonization doesn’t necessarily mean — it should not mean accepting the lowest possible standard. It means coming to a central thing.

If somebody from Lower Slobovia province — so that I don’t insult anybody — comes with a red seal, and they’re qualified to work, that doesn’t say that the person here has to hire them. And I think soon that that jurisdiction they’re coming from is going to realize — in fact, they’ll realize a lot faster — that they aren’t up to that standard and they will increase their programs. As with Yukon-trained people going out to find that they’re not getting the same opportunities, then we have to pull up our socks. So it’s not a race to the bottom; it’s adopting the best practices, and that’s where the emphasis has to be.

One of the things that we have right now, for instance, that I haven’t mentioned, is that the Agreement on Internal Trade is a national document but it doesn’t include Nunavut. However, we’re hoping that Nunavut will come in when we host the National Committee on Internal Trade meetings in the coming June here in Whitehorse, so we’ll hopefully be able to pull them in and then it will truly be a national thing.

But it really is a harmonization of things, and it’s not, unfortunately, the magic wand that we can wave the day that the Agreement on Internal Trade is accepted. It’s the goal that we have to aim toward. It’s difficult to explain — and the Member
for Whitehorse Centre points out that he had no trouble moving around. Again, there are many others who did have trouble moving around, but not necessarily the ones who are going to get the job every time, but those who are at least capable of applying, capable of getting in and doing the work, and if an employer wants to come in and say, “You know, we look at that red seal that you’ve got and we accept it and everything else, but we want you to do additional training,” they have the right to do that. That’s something that our government and, I think, most provincial and territorial governments, would look at: to bring those people up to snuff and to harmonize those regulations and standards.

It’s a challenge. It’s not an easy thing. It may require more inspection in the public safety aspects; you may want to have more detailed inspection, and that’s going to be a challenge with anybody building, be it private sector or public sector, to make sure that safety is not jeopardized, that the work is done properly. And if that requires training, so be it.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, the minister as much as admitted there that it’s not a race to the bottom, but he also admitted that it’s not a race to the top. He said it’s trying to find middle ground; it’s about harmonization. That concerns me.

The problem is that there are different standards in different provinces, and there are different methods of training. If you get a trade certificate, but all you’ve ever learned is one aspect of the trade, and you move to another jurisdiction where the requirements for training are that you are trained fully in that occupation and in all aspects of it, then we are not getting the qualified workers.

It is not a matter of whether or not — I mean the problem is that employers — especially in a labour market where it’s hard to get workers, you are going to take whomever you can get, regardless of whether they’ve got the qualifications or not. That is what concerns me: that we have people who aren’t qualified in some instances working where they shouldn’t be working. I would encourage them to find — as opposed to finding middle ground, I would encourage them to raise the bar. Take this as an opportunity to raise the bar and require the training in some of these areas to meet the highest standard.

I have another question that I would like to ask the minister from the other day that I didn’t get to. I have asked the previous Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources about this before and there was a bit of discussion going on when we were last in here about projects and the Department of Economic Development’s relationship and the partnerships they had with First Nations and how they facilitate First Nations’ participation.

The Member for Mayo-Tatchun reminded us all of the Premier’s remarks and of the promise in the Yukon Party platform to make Yukon First Nations full partners in the economic development of the Yukon Territory. The government has a lot of pull, a lot of influence — we know that. The Minister of Economic Development has a lot of influence when it comes to negotiating with mineral companies from other jurisdictions, from China, from Korea and with other companies that are coming from other jurisdictions and wanting to do business in the Yukon.

It was interesting the minister was talking the other day about, I believe, the Wolverine project and how the — I can’t pronounce the name of the company, but it’s the company from China that now owns. It’s not a public company any more. It’s a private holding by a Chinese company that owns the resources. I’m curious as to how Yukon — the minerals belong to the Yukon; they belong to the people of the Yukon. We need to ensure that economic benefits remain here for the First Nations whose traditional territory this project is in. We need to ensure there are long-term and lasting benefits for all Yukoners, as well, through mineral royalties and employment. We need to ensure that when the project is over, we aren’t left with liabilities that Yukon taxpayers are responsible for.

The question I’ve asked the minister responsible for Energy, Mines and Resources before is what influence and what can he bring to bear to influence impact benefit agreements? The Minister of Economic Development has that same influence. The Yukon government permits, after going through it and after YESAB makes its recommendations, if it’s under the authority of the Yukon government to permit a project — whether it’s a mine project or a forestry project or any other project — and there is the ability and the need to have impact benefit agreements. I would like to know what influence the Minister of Economic Development can bring to bear to ensure that these impact benefit agreements are in place for the benefit of all communities. I can wait.

The minister was hearing from one of the former ministers of Energy, Mines and Resources — sorry, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, not the former one. I would like to know what the Minister of Economic Development can do to ensure this. They talk about working in partnership with First Nations and communities. It’s about community economic development. It’s about regional economic development. He talked about strategic industries the other day. It’s about ensuring lasting benefits for the future for First Nations and for Yukon communities. What can this minister do to ensure that?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: For the member opposite, again we seem to have got back to multiple questions, so I will go back to what I see are the two basic questions coming out of this. Let me go back to the first one, regarding the Agreement on Internal Trade and talk about that for a moment.

One of the things that we’re very pleased with at this point, of course, is that I have the great honour to serve as the chair of the Committee on Internal Trade this year, and we’ll be hosting the meetings. Me, as the chair, my deputy minister and the internal trade representative all chair the respective meetings. So we have a great deal of influence as that goes along. We will host and chair the 2009 Committee on Internal Trade meetings here. So we do tend to play an important role in setting the agenda and any internal or interim CIT meetings, we will also look after.

We’ll also have the opportunity to advance issues of importance. At past meetings, the chair gave space at the CIT for presentations on TILMA and by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. The Internal Trade Secretariat provides administrative support to the chair. Its officials — they’re located in Win-
nipeg, Manitoba, headed by a very skilled international trade lawyer. They do a lot of the organization and such.

So as that comes along, we have a great deal of influence. I’ll give an example to the member opposite some of the things. For instance, with engineers, it is required that you be a member of the association to work as a professional engineer in the Yukon. One of the funnier briefings I have ever been to — one of the questions that came up during the briefing was: how many members? I think the answer was something like 347. I thought: wait a minute, there aren’t 347 people doing this work in Yukon. Well, no, this comes out of anyone who wants to do the work.

So that begs the next question: what are the requirements, then, to come up here and do that work? What sort of training in polar construction — dealing with permafrost, specifically? At the end, with everyone scratching their head, we were told that there actually aren’t any requirements for that, at which point one of the people got up, and I won’t even repeat some of the words. But the comment was much to the effect of, “No wonder our buildings keep sinking into the mud.”

We can put in those restrictions. It doesn’t matter that you have a red seal in something; you can also say that you must have specific training in a certain thing or a certain area. Or, I suppose, you come to the government and say that we think there should be training in such-and-such an area, so get us involved in it. Those are the sorts of things we’d certainly get involved in.

The idea of modular training or specialization training — the member opposite has hit a huge thing for me for the last 35 years.

One of the things in my own profession — one of the big pushes with students — is that they want to go modular. They want to specialize. They want to do work in a certain area and they don’t see the reason why they should train in another area. They want to do small animals, so why take large animals? Well, I never had an interest in large animals, but guess what I did the day I got out of school. I went into a large-animal practice. I didn’t see the reason to talk about mice and rats. Well, guess what? I did mice and rats for 17 years. The idea of modular specialized training within any program — be it red seal, be it medical, be it dental, be it anything — the member opposite has hit a real sore point with me. I think that is a terrible way to do it. Get the broad education and then take that education where you need it to go afterward. We have those capabilities.

The Member for Whitehorse Centre mentioned something about raw logs. We do have the right to say that those raw logs have to be worked in the Yukon. The Agreement on Internal Trade says that the people with the proper training — be it the accountant for the company or the cabinetmaker who is going to make the cabinets out of it — have the right to work and have the mobility to work here or anywhere else, but we do still have the right to say that those logs don’t leave.

As chair, I am very pleased to point out that I do have some influence on that. There are precious other things that I do not have influence on. If the member opposite thinks that I do, boy, I would like to get that in writing. Anyway, it is a compliment, but I’m not sure it is totally true.

In terms of working with the benefits of the mining companies — one of the things that I found very interesting as we started making the trips to China was the number of government agencies that we dealt with. Right across the board, one of the first questions that they always asked was, “Will you hold our companies to the same environmental standards?” The answer, of course, is yes — absolutely.

Again, right across the board, all of the people backed off and said, “Excellent, because if you aren’t going to do that then we aren’t going to come over there.” It wasn’t the answer that I expected. It is not an answer that — I suspect — a lot of people sort of accept, but that is the answer that we got. They have held true to that — outside of some senior management and they own the company, so it is more than their right to do that. In terms of who is working in the mine — they have been very clear that they want local people to work in the mine. They want to partner and work with the relevant First Nations. Capstone Mining Corp and the Selwyn mine is a good example of that, where a good percentage of the people working there are First Nation for both the mine and the contractors such as Pelly Construction and others who work up there.

We need to promote those capabilities and capacities. Some of the things that we do in terms of developing that — again, this is within our department; the member opposite mentioned Energy, Mines and Resources, and probably more of that falls into their purview — is being involved in developing skills inventories. We put on a conference on economic development. We have worked with one group on a regional fuel distribution and opportunity identification.

I think one of the members opposite — and I don’t remember who — the other day asked how this is a problem. Well, it is a problem when there is nowhere to buy gas in a large chunk of the Yukon. That regional fuel distribution is becoming a big problem. We have done investment opportunity assessments on tourism accommodation. If we are going to bring people in, what do we do with them? Where are we going to house them? There is the Alaska Highway pipeline First Nation collaboration, organizational assessment capacity development training and scoping studies on organizational capacity. It just goes on and on with a variety of First Nations. This is what we can do in terms of trying to develop that capacity and that capability. That is our job.

I am pleased to say that I have not dealt with any Chinese, Japanese or Korean — which have been the main groups we’ve dealt with — mining organization or government agency that has in any way not seen the benefits of getting the First Nations involved. They want to work with them. They just simply have no problems with that.

In China, there are 56 what they refer to as “minority groups.” What we would call First Nations, they call “minority groups.” Better than 95 percent of the population is Han Chinese and the other five percent are within these minority groups. It’s interesting to note that in many companies that we’ve dealt with, many of the minority groups are very well represented in the mining companies. These are the people we’re dealing with, so they have no problem at all in seeing the
great benefit of working with the Yukon’s minority groups, or First Nations.

Mr. Cardiff: I guess from my perspective, and from what I understand, over the years, with various projects, going back quite a number of years — and I don’t know, maybe it is getting better, but I can take the minister back to when I was still working construction on the Anvil Range project start-up, and there were jobs for local people, for First Nation people from Ross River, but they weren’t afforded the opportunity. It broke my heart, literally, because the company was not providing opportunities for those people to gain skills, to train as operators or tradespeople. We need to ensure that is going to happen — that communities benefit, that the people from those communities get the opportunity for training in transferable skills.

I recognize fully that when you get opportunities, along with those come responsibilities. We also have to recognize when these companies come here, just as there are cultural sensitivities in other jurisdictions — whether it be China or Japan or Korea or whether it be other provinces — whether it be from Ontario, or British Columbia or from the United States — we have to recognize those cultural differences and make allowances for them as well. It’s my concern and my belief that that’s where some of the biggest impact and benefits can be.

It is in ensuring that those opportunities are made available to people from those communities. I just hope that the government works with these companies and individuals. I am not just pointing the finger at companies from China or Korea, either. I am talking about companies from Outside — they can be from Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg or Ontario. It doesn’t matter where they come from or even if they are local companies from Whitehorse going out to do work in other communities throughout the Yukon. We need to make sure — it’s about regional economic development. It’s about keeping our communities strong, healthy and alive. Training and jobs are one way of doing that. It’s one thing that is essential to building strong, healthy communities and economic sustainability.

They say they are working with the First Nations. The government says it is working with these companies; they’re providing funding for these companies to work on business plans and other things; they’re working with mining incentive programs. They talk about having champions for these projects to help them through the regulatory process. That’s at the taxpayers’ expense. The government has hired people to help some of these projects get through the regulatory process, get permitted, get up and running, so there’s an onus on the government, because they’re helping in part of that whole process, to ensure that benefits remain in those communities.

That’s what I’m trying to get through to the minister. I think he understands. I’m just hoping that — I don’t know if there’s anything — he probably can’t say, “No, we’re not going to do this.” We’re not going to let you do this,” but you can certainly provide encouragement.

I think if there’s a willingness there to make it happen, that you can make it happen. I think it’s very important to our rural Yukon communities and to First Nation people throughout this territory that they are given the opportunity to participate fully. That was the promise the Premier made; that was the promise the Yukon Party made during the election — full economic partners; full partners in the economic development of the territory.

So I’m hoping the minister takes that to heart and that in both departments — in all departments of government — that’s the way it works.

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

Recess

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

The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 15, First Appropriation Act, 2009-10, Department of Economic Development. We will now continue with general debate.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: To the member opposite, if I can remember some of the questions here, I think there are two things that I want to get into. One is certainly the amount of analysis and such done by Economic Development, by Energy, Mines and Resources and by a wide variety of other branches of government to look at the economic impact and evaluation ahead of time before any major project occurs. Once that project is even close to starting, we have an incredible background and basis of information attached to it.

The YMTA, the Yukon Mine Training Association, as well, supports companies training workers for jobs. They pay 50 percent of the cost. We fund these and have successfully gotten federal government funds to YMTA as well. So the success at the Minto mine and the number of Selkirk First Nation citizens who are working there is, I think, a testament to that.

Also, the Selkirk “Journey to Self-Reliance,” which is about $3 million, when you put the whole thing together. I think the actual base amount is $2.1 million or $2.12 million or something like that. But, anyway, it’s closer to $3 million, when you put all of the various components together. Our involvement with the mine training program dovetails within northern strategy money. So there are a number of different ways to have that training occur and get people up to speed with what they have to do with that.

Chair: Is there any further general debate?

Seeing none, we’ll proceed line by line in Vote 7, Department of Economic Development.

Mr. McRobb: Given that there aren’t that many lines in O&M or capital, we would request a breakdown for each item.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

On Corporate Services

On Deputy Minister’s Office

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Chair, as standard with past practice, I’d request you do not clear an item until the opposition signals to clear it. As you are aware, I just requested the minister to provide a breakdown on each line —

Chair: Order please.
Chair’s statement

Chair: The Chair expects members not to inject the Chair into debate. We are proceeding line by line on Vote 7. Currently, we are debating the Deputy Minister’s Office for $538,000. Is there any debate on that line, please?

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Chair, as I requested a minute ago, we would appreciate a breakdown of each of the line items, and this is the first one.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Personnel here includes the deputy minister, an administrative assistant and a senior advisor for special projects, for a total of three FTEs. Membership costs are for the Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships, $6,000.

The 31-percent or $128,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to 2009-10 mains is due to collective agreement impacts, wage market adjustment and merit increases for employees in the amount of $28,000; and staffing of vacant positions within the unit, another $100,000. The $98,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 mains is due to wage-settlement impacts and merit increases of approximately $55,000. The expected filling of a vacant position in 2009-10, $86,000 is partially offset by increased advertising and marketing costs, incurred in 2008-09, of about $43,000.

On Deputy Minister’s Office

Deputy Minister’s Office in the amount of $538,000 agreed to

On Corporate Administration

Mr. McRobb: I thought the Yukon Party had an undertaking to expedite debate. Do I have to get up each time and request a breakdown?

I have already put it on record twice that we would like a breakdown for each line item. This is the second one.

Chair’s statement

Chair: Just to clarify for members, when we are debating, line by line, we are only debating that line. If you have any questions on future lines in this debate, you have to ask those questions during that debate on that particular line. Currently, we are on Corporate Administration for $759,000.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Corporate Administration, $759,000 — personnel costs of $632,000; communications, $7,000; departmental software licences, $24,000; contracts for system operations, space planning, etc., $23,000; $5,000 for training; for department systems, $29,000; and, record supplies and program, materials, repairs, members, travel and other materials for $39,000.

The personnel costs include the director, two financial budget analysts, an accounting clerk, records manager, systems administrator, human resources assistant and the manager of human resources, for a total of seven FTEs. The four-percent or $26,000 increase from the 2008-09 main estimates is mainly due to position reclassifications, position merit increases, and collective agreement impacts.

The $106,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 mains is due to the reclassification and merit increases of $61,000; the hiring of a STEP student in 2008-09 of $5,000; a vacancy in the head of records position in 2006-07, $54,000; and less training and administrative expenses et cetera than was anticipated in 2006-07, for a further $29,000.

Corporate Administration in the amount of $759,000 agreed to

Corporate Services in the amount of $1,297,000 agreed to

On Corporate Planning and Economic Policy

On Directorate

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Chair, I would remind the minister that we would like a breakdown for each line item. This is not necessarily productive having to stand and request it for each line. In the past, the ministers would just proceed to a breakdown on the line after the Chair announces it. If I have to stand each time and if Hansard has to take the time to write it all down on the paper then I’ll do that but it would expedite the debate if we are all on the same page and the minister would just provide a breakdown. I would like to request that the Minister of Economic Development provide us with a breakdown of O&M expenditures for Activities, Directorate, $197,000.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: The member opposite is always a bit excited when we don’t provide information and he gets excited when we do. Unfortunately, as has been pointed out, we debate line by line — knowing what lines other than that require a magic wand and that is not something that I have — unfortunately.

Directorate, $197,000 — this includes $151,000 for personnel costs, $10,000 for memberships, $7,000 contract services, $6,000 for branch staff training and $23,000 for support costs, such as travel, communications and program materials.

The personnel costs consist of the assistant deputy minister’s position, one FTE; memberships are for the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region, or PNWER, $9,000; Canadian Evaluation Society, $500; and the Conference Board of Canada for $500.

The four percent, or $7,000, increase from forecast mains is due to merit and market adjustment increases to wages of $9,000; the $24,000 increase from 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to market adjustments of wage levels and merit increases of $6,000; increased travel cost for attendance at senior-level meetings, $7,000; and less administrative expenditures than anticipated in 2007-08, which is about $11,000.

Directorate in the amount of $197,000 agreed to

On Communications

Mr. McRobb: The minister is aware we would like a line item breakdown for each line item as they’re announced. He doesn’t need a magic wand; all he has to do is listen to the Chair and proceed with a breakdown. That would save a lot of time; it would save a lot of Hansard if he would do that, rather than me having to get up each time and put into words that we’d like to have a breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Responding to the Chair as we go line by line — for the member opposite, that is why it’s called “line by line” — under Communications for $128,000, this activity includes $90,000 for personnel costs; support costs, such as departmental advertising, $10,000; $4,000 communica-
tion cost; contracts relating to communication issues, about $15,000; and program materials, printing, et cetera, $9,000.

Now if we go into that a little bit more completely: personnel includes a communications manager and a communications analyst, or two FTEs. The 10 percent, $12,000, increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to negotiated wage collective agreements and merit increases for the unit’s employees.

The $49,000 decrease from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to the branch carrying the department-wide vacancy rate of $84,000 in 2009-10, offset by negotiated collective agreements and merit impacts of $28,000 and increased advertising and marketing initiatives expected for 2009-10 of $7,000.

Communications in the amount of $128,000 agreed to On Policy and Planning

Mr. McRobb: For the minister — it would save a lot of time if he would just proceed to a breakdown.

That would avoid us having to stand up and put on the record the request at every opportunity. So, again, we would like a breakdown of this line item, as we would for every line item in the department.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: In corporate planning and economic policy, we can look at a variety of parts of that. It is, of course, to develop policies and strategies, programs and legislative instruments to support departmental and governmental objectives. It is to provide information, analysis and advice to decision-makers to ensure balanced and considered economic actions. It is to monitor and evaluate economic trends, issues and opportunities affecting the Yukon and to work closely with other governments — national, regional, First Nation and municipal — to cooperatively achieve Yukon benefits.

Now, within Policy and Planning of $623,000, this activity includes personnel costs of $505,000; contracts of $75,000; the Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment administrative costs of $16,000; and $27,000 toward other miscellaneous support costs.

Personnel costs include one director, a policy analyst, two senior policy advisers and a legislative support assistant, or, five FTEs. Contract dollars assist the unit when additional professional and legal resources are required, such as the Agreement on Internal Trade and Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission — CRTC — policies. That is $50,000.

The one-percent or $5,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimate is due to negotiated employee merit and collective agreement increases. The $98,000 increase from 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to reorganization costs in the department’s personnel. There is $31,000 for merit and collective agreement increases, and the planning and analyst positions that were vacant in 2006-07 — another $54,000.

This is partially offset by a one-time cost in 2007-08 for out-of-territory travel related to PNWER, or the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region, for TILMA, the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement, and other senior official meetings, and that worked out to about $18,000.

Chair: Is there any further debate on Policy and Planning, $623,000?

Mr. Hardy: The minister mentioned the Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment. I think he said $16,000; I may be misquoting that. Why are we spending money on Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment initiatives, when the last member of that council has basically had their term expired?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: For the member opposite, the Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment was originally established, for those who aren’t familiar — there must be someone out there who isn’t familiar — for reviewing major policy and strategic legislative and program initiatives at the request of government. Yukon’s framework for reviewing economic and environmental issues has evolved as a result of devolution, a stronger economy, and particularly through the implementation of the comprehensive review process in the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act or YESAA.

The Yukon Council on the Economy and Environment’s role has been overtaken by these developments and requires a thorough review to determine how that mandate will be looked after. The member is quite accurate in saying that the committee hasn’t met since February 2005, I believe. There were only three meetings before that in 2004. The annual budget for YCEE has been approximately $50,000 a year and is currently shared between the departments of Economic Development, Environment and Energy, Mines and Resources. In years past, the limit was sometimes reached and in years more current the limit was not reached. However, that amount must be in the budget should that group or a similar group be reconstituted. That is under review by all departments. In light of YESAA and that particular act and that particular regime, the Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment seems rather redundant.

Mr. Hardy: Well, I actually disagree. I was a member of that council, and I believe that it had a very good role to play in the task assigned to it by the governments that respected the role and duties that were assigned to public members, as well as members from a huge cross-section of our society. That’s something that we don’t see now in place. As a matter of fact, it has been replaced by “key stakeholders”, and we often don’t know who they mean.

I can’t understand why that money stays in the budget, if this government’s whole intention for the last few years has been to kill Yukon Council on the Economy and the Environment. Can this minister inform me if he anticipates this money being lapsed? They will obviously not be meeting, as there was only one member left, no terms have been reinstated, and I think that term comes up on April 5.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Just in response to that to the member opposite, it’s still necessary to put that amount into the budget and be able to plan for that, whatever happens. I do agree with the member opposite that, in its day, it had a great use. Unfortunately, that day is no more. We live under a completely different regime, and it’s important that we harmonize
that recurrent regime and reality with what we have to deal with.

Mr. Hardy: We’re going to go back and forth all day long. I’m not going to sit here and say that group of people and those organizations that participated and contributed to the well-being of the Yukon and helped assist all governments no longer has a use. It still has a use. The regime hasn’t changed that much, and frankly, the issues that are facing the Yukon around the economy and the environment have increased. If there has ever been a time where we need more people involved in advising the departments and the government, now is the time. So I don’t like to think that people feel that regime has lost its use. Those people contributed a substantial amount of effort and time and are still willing to do it.

It’s a good thing I suppose for us to simply agree to disagree. We do have a new regime with YESAA. We have to work with that; that’s the law; that’s what we’ve negotiated and that’s what we’ve committed. But in terms of the budget, the money is there. Would it be lapsed? Would it be revoked? Would it be put into other projects as the year goes by?

Those are all good possibilities, but it still has to be in the budget.

Policy and Planning in the amount of $623,000 agreed to

On Business and Economic Research

Mr. McRobb: Again, we have an example of the Yukon Party government not fulfilling the Premier’s pledge to expedite debate. There’s nothing stopping the minister from commencing with a breakdown of the line item, as we’ve put on the record now about four or five times, but if he’d like me to stand each time and remind him we do want a breakdown, I guess I can do that. It’s sure not a very productive way to spend our time in here, Mr. Chair, and it’s not very productive to have it all printed up in Hansard.

Again, can we get a breakdown of this line item?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: That is why it is called “line by line”. It is not called “get up, talk and hope you hit the right target”.

The business and economic research component of the budget is to develop policies, strategies, programs and legislative instruments to support department and government objectives. It is to provide information, analysis and advice to decision-makers. It is to ensure balanced and considered economic actions. It is to monitor and evaluate economic trends, issues and opportunities affecting the Yukon. It is to work closely with other governments — national, regional, First Nation, municipal; all orders of government — to cooperatively achieve Yukon benefits.

The business and economic research component is $539,000. Of that, $438,000 comes into personnel costs. There is $63,000 for contracts for economic surveys, impacts and statistical analysis, and $28,000 to support costs such as communications, travel and program materials.

The personnel costs include a director of business and economic research, a senior economist, a senior econometric analyst and a senior business development analyst, or, four FTEs.

The three-percent or $15,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 mains is due to negotiated employee merit and collective agreement impacts. The $42,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 mains is due to a one-time secondment opportunity in 2007-08 for the director, resulting in salary savings in 2007-08 of $38,000 and collective agreement and merit impacts of $20,000. These increases to 2009-10 are partially offset by an expected decrease in travel, contracting and other miscellaneous support costs of about $16,000 for the unit.

Business and Economic Research in the amount of $539,000 agreed to

Corporate Planning and Economic Policy in the amount of $1,487,000 agreed to

On Business and Trade

On Directorate

Chair: Is there any debate on that line?

Mr. McRobb: Can we get a breakdown on this?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, not painful at all.

The program objectives here are as follows: to administer the business incentive program; to promote the Yukon’s strategic and competitive advantages for business and industry investment; to assist Yukon businesses to export and expand their markets; to facilitate the development and expansion of new and existing small and medium enterprises; and to provide ongoing assessment and monitoring of the business climate.

Now, the $257,000 breakdown is as follows: $206,000 for personnel support; $6,000 for staff training; $15,000 for specialized contract support; and $30,000 for support costs. Specifically, the personnel costs consist of a director and an administrative assistant. The roughly zero-percent or $1,000 decrease from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 mains is due to the staffing of new employees at the lower end of the salary range. The $33,000 decrease from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 mains is due to one-time additional casual help required in 2007-08 for about $16,000, as well as advertising and travel costs incurred for staffing in 2007-08 of about $17,000, and that’s not anticipated in the 2009-10 budget.

Directorate in the amount of $257,000 agreed to

On Investment

Mr. McRobb: Can we get a breakdown?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, the program objective is to administer the business incentive program, or the BIP, to promote the Yukon’s strategic and competitive advantages for business and industry, to assist Yukon businesses to export and expand their markets, to facilitate the development and expansion of new and existing SMEs, or small and medium enterprises, and to provide ongoing assessment in the monitoring of the business climate.

Now, the $363,000 there breaks down as follows: $98,000 for personnel costs; $18,000 for advertising to promote programs and services; $5,000 for program materials, such as brochures; $26,000 for specialized services to support projects and seminars; $45,000 for departmental marketing and the Web portal maintenance; for facility rental and other costs for meetings, $7,000; the Olympic 2010 economic initiative is $135,000; and support costs, such as communication and travel, of $29,000.
Now the personnel costs consist of a senior business and trade advisor and one FTE; and the 84 percent, or $166,000, change from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to an employee working on a reduced workweek — that was about $6,000; a one-time initiative in 2009-10 to promote Yukon’s economic advantages at the 2010 winter Olympics — $135,000; and Internet Web maintenance and upkeep costs for the mining Web portal of $45,000. In 2008-09 there was also a one-time, 100-percent cost-recoverable, for investment meetings with the Department of Foreign Affairs and that was about $8,000.

The $232,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to the investment facilitator position being vacant for part of 2007-08, about $60,000; and two new initiatives in 2009-10: participation in the 2010 Olympics for $135,000 and upkeep of the mining Web portal for $45,000. These are partially offset by one-time administrative dollars used in 2007-08 to fund marketing program materials, and that was about $8,000.

Investment in the amount of $363,000 agreed to

On Trade

Mr. McRobb: A breakdown, please?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, the objectives here are to administer the business incentive program. It is a program that is negotiated exempt from the Agreement in Internal Trade. We continue to promote Yukon’s strategic and competitive advantages for industry and business. We involve ourselves with export and expanding markets to make shows, producing — or assisting in the production — of business plans, et cetera, and to provide, again, ongoing assessment and monitoring of the business climate.

The budget there of $355,000 includes personnel costs of $202,000; consulting services for promoting trade missions and conferences of $67,000; advertising to promote business conferences, $11,000; program materials, such as brochures for trade missions and conferences, $15,000; facility rental for meetings and seminars, $12,000; our membership in the Canada Export Centre, $8,000, and we are a charter member of that organization so we have a substantial savings on that; contributions to third parties organizing trade initiatives, $19,000; and support costs, such as communication and travel, of $21,000.

To delve further into that, Mr. Chair, personnel costs are for a senior business and trade advisor and a trade promotion officer — that is two FTEs or full-time employees. Administrative costs are to support trade initiatives, both through incoming familiarization or fam tours and discovery tours, and those organizations hosting various trade initiatives, such as the Meet the North Conference, economic summits, gold shows, et cetera.

The 13 percent, or $51,000, change, from the 2008-09 forecasts and the 2009-10 main estimates is due to merit increases and collective agreement impacts for $7,000; miscellaneous support costs of $5,000; one-time costs incurred in 2008-09 for Opportunities North for $50,000; and a revote for the Communities Future program of $13,000.

The $6,000 change from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to casual help for the trade and promotion officer position in 2007-08, and that was $19,000 — that’s not required for 2009-10 — offset by anticipated costs for trade initiatives and economic familiarization tours, in keeping with the investment attraction strategy of $25,000.

Trade in the amount of $355,000 agreed to

On Business Development

Mr. McRobb: Could I have a breakdown?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: This involves assisting Yukon businesses to export and expand markets, facilitates development and expansion of new and existing small and medium enterprises and providing an ongoing assessment. The $414,000 involves $109,000 in personnel costs; consulting services for promoting seminars and workshops for small business capacity development, $134,000; advertising to promote the business conferences, $4,000; program materials such as information kits, $8,000; $2,000 for printing materials for workshops; $3,000 for facility rental for meetings; $145,000 worth of contributions to third parties organizing business initiatives; and for support costs such as communication and travel, a further $9,000.

Now the personnel costs are for the senior business and trade advisor, one FTE. Contributions are broken down as follows: the Yukon Chamber of Commerce operation support, $36,000; Canada-Yukon Business Service Centre, $45,000; the Yukon Federation of Labour, $36,000; Yukon Building and Construction Trades Council, $15,000; the Business Development Bank of Canada, $5,000; and trade initiatives, $8,000.

The one-percent or $4,000 decrease from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to an employee wage being budgeted at lower levels on the wage scale, and the $50,000 increase from 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to costs associated with business advisory services in Yukon and hosting of various seminars for business workshops and capacity development.

Business Development in the amount of $414,000 agreed to

Business and Trade in the amount of $1,389,000 agreed to

On Regional Economic Development

On Directorate

Chair: Under directorate activities for $316,000, is there any debate on that line?

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: The regional economic development budget — really, the objectives are to become the Government of Yukon’s focal point for First Nations’ economic development, to foster regional and community economic development, to work in partnership with First Nations and others initiating or implementing regional economic plans, and to proactively administer the community development fund.

To give a better breakdown on that, of the $316,000, the personnel costs are $207,000; consulting services, $51,000; advertising, $9,000; various costs to host and attend meetings and seminars, $35,000; and miscellaneous support costs of $14,000.

Now, to give more detail on that, which I know the Member for Kluane enjoys, personnel costs are for a director’s posi-
tion and an administrative assistant, which is two FTEs; the 17 percent, or $45,000, increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to negotiated collective agreement impacts, mirrored increases in wage market adjustment costs, $12,000; and a one-time transfer of budget dollars from the Directorate to the First Nation and economic development unit due to a one-time recruitment cost in 2008-09, and that’s $33,000. The $72,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to the collective agreement merit impacts of $25,000; and less expenditures than anticipated in the Directorate from 2007-08 of $47,000.

Chair: We were currently debating the line Directorate — $316,000. Is there any further debate on $316,000, Directorate?

Directorate in the amount of $316,000 agreed to
On First Nations and Regional Economic Development
Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: This is where, really, it is highlighted for First Nations and regional economic development to be a focal point of First Nation economic development for the Government of Yukon, to foster regional and community economic development, and to work in partnership with First Nations initiating or implementing regional economic plans.

The activities include: personnel costs, $407,000; consulting services to facilitate business workshops, roundtable meetings and marketing development, $115,000; program materials and support for meetings and operations, et cetera, $28,000; travel to communities, and economic summit, et cetera, $55,000; support costs, including supplies, communication costs, et cetera, of $19,000.

Now to delve into these figures a bit, the personnel costs are for four regional economic development advisors, four FTEs. The 15-percent or $80,000 change from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to merit and collective agreement impacts of $13,000; vacancies in the 2008-09 in the business advisory positions, almost $100,000; offset by a decrease in administrative costs due to a one-time transfer from the Directorate to fund recruitment costs of $33,000.

The $60,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to a vacancy in advisor positions in 2007-08 of about $50,000, and decreased administrative costs as a result of a position vacancy of $10,000.

Regional Economic Development in the amount of $624,000 agreed to
On Strategic Industries Development

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: This brings us into the strategic industries development branch. The main function of this branch is to promote and facilitate development in Yukon’s strategic emerging industry sectors, to work in partnership with industry and government, to establish common priorities and plans for growth and expansion, and to identify and promote strategic opportunities for business projects to benefit Yukon’s economy.

Within the Directorate line is $530,000: personnel costs of $449,000; consulting and other costs required for specialized professional services, $38,000; a further $9,000 for advertising; $4,000 for communications; $7,000 for training; and $23,000 for support costs, such as program materials, travel and other things.

Again, if we delve into that figure, Mr. Chair, we will find personnel costs are for an assistant deputy minister, a director and two administrative assistants, or four FTEs; a 14-percent or $66,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to merit and collective agreement impacts, as well as new hires at the higher end of the wage scale, $46,000; and increased contracting dollars to cover specialized professional services for another $20,000.

The $109,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to merit and collective agreement impacts of $45,000; vacancies for a portion of the year in the director’s and an administrative assistant position, $84,000; and specialized consulting services require $20,000 for various sector studies and initiatives.

Directorate in the amount of $530,000 agreed to
On Non-Renewable Resource Industries
Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Under the non-renewable resource industries, that is part of the strategic industries development branch. They are really to identify and promote the opportunities and business projects that benefit Yukon’s economy.

Within the non-renewable industries section, this activity involves $209,000 for personnel costs; contracts to develop the Yukon’s strategic and emerging industry sector is $55,000; travel and promotion to support the non-renewable resource sector, a further $19,000; and support costs, such as communication, program materials and so forth, $30,000.

For the member opposite, if we look further into those figures, we will find personnel costs for a manager of natural resources and a senior business development advisor, for a total of two FTEs. This is to facilitate the development and growth of non-renewable resource industries projects. The 27-percent or $67,000 change from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to vacancies in positions in 2008-09 of about $97,000, and that is offset by a transfer of budget dollars for specialized contracting services to the Directorate of about $30,000. The $57,000 change from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to a new position for a manager of natural resources for $110,000 and merit and collective agreement impacts for a further $14,000. This is offset by a reduction in program administration costs to cover the new position of about $110,000 and a one-time cost incurred in 2007-08 for specialized sector consulting contracts, required as a result of the branch focus on the industrial benefits strategy, which was about $80,000.

Non-Renewable Resource Industries in the amount of $313,000 agreed to
On Renewable Resource Industries
Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: On the renewable resource side, this is still within the strategic industries development branch,
which promotes and facilitates the development of Yukon strategic and emerging industry sectors — in this case, of course, within the renewable resource sector. That activity is $101,000 for personnel, consulting cost for developing the Yukon’s renewable resource sector, $23,000, and support costs for travel, communication, program materials, meetings, et cetera, of about $20,000.

If we delve into those numbers again, personnel costs are for a senior business development advisor — one FTE — to facilitate the development of renewable resource industries and projects. The 24-percent or $46,000 decrease from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to new employees hired at the lower end of the salary range, which accounted for about $4,000, and a one-time revote approved in 2008-09 for a forestry attraction strategy for $42,000.

The $8,000 change from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to the new senior business development advisor hired at the lower end of the range for about $4,000, which was offset by increased support costs expected for the unit now that the position is permanently filled. That accounts for about $12,000.

Renewable Resource Industries in the amount of $144,000 agreed to

On Cultural Industries

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: It’s a pleasure to give some of the breakdowns on this and other branches. Now the cultural industries part of strategic industries has much of the same program initiatives to identify and to promote those strategic opportunities for business. It includes $101,000 for personnel costs; consulting costs, $23,000; and support costs for travel, communication, program materials, meetings, et cetera, of a further $14,000. Personnel costs are for the senior business development advisor to facilitate the development and growth of cultural industries, or one FTE; the five-percent or $7,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to the advisor being hired at the lower end of the salary range, worth about $3,000; and offset by increased contracting costs required for the sector of about $10,000.

The $2,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due mainly to the collective agreement and merit impacts of about $5,000, partially offset by decreased advertising costs due to one-time expenses in the 2007-08 year for position advertising.

Cultural Industries in the amount of $148,000 agreed to

On Innovation and Technology

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Innovation and technology is an integral part of strategic industries. Not only does that promote the discovery and development of innovation and technology within the Yukon, but tries to ensure that that technology, the use of that technology and the economic spinoffs of that technology, remain in the Yukon. As I have said before, it makes little sense to develop a widget that is then produced in Manitoba. We would like to produce them here.

So within the innovation and technology sector for $229,000, there are personnel costs of $101,000; transfer payments of $100,000; specialized consulting services, $13,000; and a further $15,000 for support costs for travel, communications, program materials and meetings.

If we delve into those figures, Mr. Chair, we find that personnel costs are for a senior business development advisor to facilitate the development and growth of the technology sector; and transfer payments include Technology Innovation Centre, $85,000; for operations and the Yukon Information Technology Industry Society, $15,000, to assist them with potentially hosting an IT week.

Contracting is for specialized consulting costs for the IT and telecommunications sector.

The one-percent or $3,000 decrease from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to recruitment of new employees at the lower end of the wage scale; and the $26,000 increase from the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is mainly due to employee merit and collective agreement impacts of about $5,000; anticipated funding of $15,000 for an IT technology workshop in 2009-10, and support costs to the Technology Innovation Centre.

Innovation and Technology in the amount of $229,000 agreed to

On Film and Sound Commission

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, the Film and Sound Commission is an integral part of the strategic industries development. I mentioned before in the House that our studies so far show that every dollar invested into the Film and Sound Commission comes back with about nine and a half or 10 dollars return into the economy — so a very, very worthwhile group indeed.

The $519,000 Film and Sound Commission allotment includes personnel costs of $295,000; $70,000 for consulting services, which is location scouting and marketing strategy development; $25,000 for advertising; $55,000 in contributions of a variety of things; and $74,000 in support costs, such as staff communication and travel.

Now, again, if we delve into this in more detail, the personnel costs are for a film and sound commissioner, a film officer and a sound officer, or three FTEs, for promotion of the film and sound industry in the Yukon and to encourage producers to choose the Yukon as the location of choice for filming their productions and commercials. Contributions include operational assistance to Music Yukon for various marketing and sound development projects; $50,000 is the contribution to the Yukon Film Society for their annual summer tour — a further $5,000.

The three percent or $14,000 increase from the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to negotiated wage settlement impacts, merit increases and wage market adjustment costs; and the $22,000 increase of the 2007-08 actuals to the 2009-10 main estimates is due to negotiated wage settlement impacts of approximately $13,000 and expected increase in expenditures for scouting and for marketing the Yukon as a prime location to produce the films.

I should say, Mr. Chair, that it does give me great pleasure to explain in detail the percentage and dollar differences be-
between the 2008-09 forecast to the 2009-10 mains, as well as the actuals to the mains. Again, the reason for this — and I hope the members opposite are starting to understand the differences here. Again, I refer back to the print media in Whitehorse that, on March 20, reported that the strategic industries development fund had been cut by 34 percent.

In fact, it is exactly the same as was approved in the 2008-09 main estimates. The article confused the strategic industries development program with the strategic industries development fund. The program includes the strategic industries development fund with the technology partnerships, with the film and sound incentive programs that I’ve just gone through and some projects funded under northern strategy and the targeted investment program.

The 2009-10 budget for strategic industries development program is down six percent from 2008-09, due to the end of some of the northern strategies funding from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. However — always a however, Mr. Chair — the 2009-10 strategic industries development program budget is 34 percent lower than the 2008-09 forecast due to one-time items in the 2008-09 forecast and revote items in 2007-08.

It is an easy mistake to make, I suppose, for someone who doesn’t understand economics. The budget is basically the same. It involves a variety of projects; for instance, the $1,225 million one-time funding in 2008-09, which was a result of the northern strategy projects. That included: the e-commerce project for $576,000 for Council of Yukon First Nations; the cold climate innovation research project of $649,000; strategic industries development fund of $168,000; the Technology Innovation Centre of $109,000; the community access program of $168,000; the technology partnerships of $9,000; and the film incentive programs at $26,000. There was also a $70,000 one-time funding in the 2008-09 budget year for the community access program from Industry Canada, and $200,000 in 2008-09 for the completion of the Indian and Northern Affairs targeted investment program and their support for the Yukon Cold Climate Innovation Centre with the recruitment of a director, and other administrative costs. This doesn’t continue into the future.

Some of the decreases in there, as I have mentioned, are $40,000 to market the Yukon as a film destination, $560,000 as a one-time increase for 2009-10, toward a Yukon spend on the deferred project Anash and the Legacy of the Sun-Rock, scheduled to film in the Yukon in the summer of 2009, and a $70,000 change in 2009-10 in the strategic industries fund due to a one-time reduction to the fund of 2008-09, to support a Department of Tourism initiative.

So, again, I thank the member opposite for the ability to explain the differences of mains-to-forecast versus mains-to-mains. Hopefully we won’t see inaccurate articles like those appearing in the papers in the future.

Film and Sound Commission in the amount of $519,000 agreed to

Strategic Industries Development in the amount of $1,883,000 agreed to

On Revenues

Revenues cleared

On Transfer Payments

Transfer Payments in the amount of $319,000 agreed to

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of $6,996,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

On Corporate Services

On Office Furniture, Equipment, Systems and Space

Mr. McRobb: Breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Obviously, the objectives here are to provide leadership in achieving the departmental goals and objectives and to assist the department in managing its financial, human and information resources.

Under office furniture, equipment, systems and space, $56,000, that breaks down into a $20,000 budget for fund management system usability enhancements and $36,000 for computer workstations and printers.

Now, to delve into those numbers a little bit more accurately and completely, Mr. Chair, the funding for furniture, equipment, systems and space are for the following: $20,000 to implement usability enhancements and to develop reporting tools for the coordinated departmental database system that tracks funds managed by the department. The database has the ability to report progress on both projects and the funds with the goal of providing reports that measure success.

And speaking of reporting progress, Mr. Chair, seeing the time, I move that we report progress.

Chair: Any further debate on office furniture, equipment system and space?

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Chair: I apologize. I missed that. Mr. Kenyon has moved that Committee of the Whole report progress.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Cathers: I move that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Cathers that the Speaker do now resume 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. Nordick: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 15, First Appropriation Act, 2009-10, and directed me to report progress.

Speaker: You have heard the report of 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. Monday.
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