

**Yukon Legislative Assembly
Whitehorse, Yukon
Monday, May 17, 2010 — 1:00 p.m.**

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

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

Are there any tributes?

TRIBUTES

In recognition of Aboriginal Awareness Week and National Aboriginal Day

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I rise today to pay tribute in recognition of Aboriginal Awareness Week. It is indeed a pleasure and an honour, as always, to rise to celebrate Yukon aboriginal culture, traditions and history; and really, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate aboriginal culture on an ongoing basis throughout the year — through our cooperative efforts with Yukon First Nations in the number of areas that are vital to this territory's history, its present and its future. Through the final and self-governments we have recognized the importance of Yukon First Nations' culture, their history, their involvement in our territory and of course their heritage. Through our cooperative undertakings with First Nations outside the agreements, we provide services and programs about aboriginal culture, history and languages, in many cases in our schools. As well, we provide funding for aboriginal people at the Yukon Native Language Centre, Mr. Speaker, and we all know of the excellent work done by the Yukon libraries and archives in preserving and promoting various aspects of aboriginal history and their culture.

So, Mr. Speaker, the list of positive undertakings with Yukon First Nations is indeed long. Yukon First Nations are leaders in Canada in terms of self-government. Yukon is richer because of the First Nations' full participation in all aspects of Yukon life — political, economic, social and cultural.

Yukon is committed to working with First Nations and Canada on building capacity for Yukon First Nation governments and by supporting First Nations. We are investing in vibrant partnerships and collaboration among all orders of government in a modern-day Yukon.

Celebrating and showcasing aboriginal culture was one of our main objectives at the Vancouver 2010 Olympic Games. That was done through supporting CYFN's Yukon First Nations 2010 project, as well as supporting First Nation visual and performing artists at the Cultural Olympiad. I can say with the greatest confidence that they served us well and were great ambassadors for our territory and one of the most visited venues at the Olympics. At Yukon First Nations Day on February 21, activities included *What the Land Remembers* — *Tales of Raven and Wolf* performed at the Aboriginal Pavilion.

In addition to recognizing Aboriginal Awareness Week, Yukon celebrates National Aboriginal Day on June 21. I would invite all members to join me while the House is sitting to draw attention to that very special day. In addition to the national day, Yukon celebrates aboriginal awareness with special events held during Public Service Week in June.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I invite all honourable members and indeed the Yukon public to help celebrate Yukon aboriginal culture during the special events planned next month and indeed throughout each and every year. Thank you.

Mr. Fairclough: I rise today on behalf of the Official Opposition to pay tribute to Aboriginal Awareness Week and to aboriginal people everywhere.

Aboriginal peoples in Canada are comprised of First Nations, Inuit and Métis, with each having their own history, language and culture. Aboriginal people have faced many challenges to preserve and foster their language and traditional way of life. Despite their struggles, First Nations have made great strides and are adapting to the changing world around them.

Aboriginal people are the first people of this land. I find it interesting that some of the earliest archaeological sites of human habitation in Canada are right here in the Yukon in the Old Crow Flats and in Bluefish Caves.

In Yukon, we have 14 First Nations, 11 of the 14 having self-government final agreements. Yukon First Nations lead the way in many business ventures and are partners in many others, and are huge contributors to Yukon's economy.

On June 13, 1996, the Governor General of Canada signed a proclamation designating June 21 as National Aboriginal Day — a day to celebrate Canada's Indian, Inuit and Métis and the important contributions they have made to our country. June 21 was chosen because of the cultural significance of the summer solstice and the longest day of the year.

From coast to coast to coast, may the first peoples of our past always be proud partners of our future. We must all work together, share this land and be caretakers of Mother Earth for the next generation.

Mr. Cardiff: I rise on behalf of the NDP caucus to recognize National Aboriginal Awareness Week. Aboriginal peoples in Canada consist of First Nations, Inuit and Métis populations. They total well over one million Canadians.

There are 608 First Nation administrations in Canada, with 52 distinct cultural groups located in every corner of our country. They speak over 50 aboriginal languages and many more dialects. We're fortunate in the north that general awareness of aboriginal culture and issues is relatively high compared to most of Canada. The experience of land claims and self-government agreements has served as a positive educational experience for First Nations and non-First Nations alike.

In many cases, the history of First Nations was known only to anthropologists, prior to land claims settlements. Now most of us are very aware of the sad history in our territory of residential schools and attempts to assimilate First Nations into mainstream Canadian culture. We are also proud of the lan-

guage, culture and traditions and the ecological knowledge of our First Nation citizens.

Today I want to speak mostly about First Nation governance, which has a set of challenges unique to the aboriginal way of life. In the early 19th century, British and Canadian governments began interfering directly with the autonomy and the sovereignty of indigenous nations. They forcefully disposed of the traditional governments and replaced them with a system of indirect rule effected through newly created offices of chief and council. This system soon became federal policy and was institutionalized in the *Indian Act*.

Today many communities are actively pursuing the renewal of traditional governance or the renewal of traditions within a system of governance that combines the elements of First Nations and imported Canadian political traditions. The federal *First Nations Governance Act*, which is yet to be proceeded with, provides for the re-establishment of traditional forms of government or to integrate traditions within the band council form of government.

But there are many conflicts in this proposal since some non-First Nation concepts are kept as principles. For instance, to be compliant with the *First Nations Governance Act*, First Nation leadership selection codes must provide for elected officials. In contrast, some traditional systems of leadership selection are merit-based or involve a consensual nomination process in a public gathering of all members.

First Nations are responding to contemporary issues in governance. They are facing the challenge of building governance systems that can meet community and external expectations for increased transparency, accountability and efficiency. There has been a diversity of response across Canada and we can see the beginnings of integrating traditions into First Nation governments here in the Yukon.

It is not an easy path, but it is an exciting time for all of us in government to contemplate issues and principles involved in the different forms of governing. We need to embrace these challenges with optimism and to learn how to work jointly within them as a true government-to-government process.

In recognition of the International Day Against Homophobia

Mr. Cardiff: Today I rise on behalf of the Legislative Assembly to pay tribute to this, the International Day Against Homophobia. This day has been chosen to draw attention to homophobia because it is the day the World Health Organization finally removed homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses. Homosexuality is not a mental illness, nor is it a choice.

The theme this year is "Speaking about Silence: Homophobia in the Sports World." Athletes and others involved in the sports world are no more homophobic than any other people, but the sports environment is known for its silence on anything dealing with sexual diversity.

We live in a time when society has grown sensitive to sexual diversity and sexual minority issues, but the sports world has a lifestyle and a focus on physical performance and it is a world of stereotypes of what a man or a woman should be. In that world, masculinity and femininity can only be heterosexual. Boys who are gay and girls who are lesbians are also at-

tracted to sports and they wish to take part in them, or make a career out of them. People in athletic organizations know what rules to play by. Being gay or lesbian needs to be tucked away in the closet and silence is the name of the game.

The sports world needs to join in society's progress and put an end to the silence on gay men, lesbians, bi-sexual, transsexual or transgender issues and recognize the fact of diversity within sports as well as everywhere else.

Just like other human rights issues, such as racism and anti-Semitism, homophobia is a form of discrimination. It originates in a lack of awareness of sexual minority issues and, at times, it appears unconsciously. Negative attitudes can lead to rejection and to direct or indirect discrimination toward anyone whose physical appearance or behaviour does not fit the masculine or feminine stereotypes. Homophobia is often pervasive and hidden, surfacing in numerous ways. Depending on the circumstances, displays of homophobia can range from simple jokes to verbal or physical violence.

We can put an end to this inhumane atmosphere by being conscious of the results of this type of discrimination in our daily lives and to welcome diversity in all things human, including sexuality. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Any further tributes? Introduction of visitors, please.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: There are a number of things that all of us cherish and I don't think anything more than long-term relationships and long-term friendships. So it gives me great pleasure today to introduce — I won't say what year of the graduating class of the Clarence Fulton Senior High School of Vernon, British Columbia.

Over the past 43 years these women have maintained high school friendships and have gotten together on a regular basis. Some have known each other since kindergarten. For the last six years they have been getting together at one or another's home or stomping grounds once each year and this is Yukon's year.

Susan worked at the Dezadeash Lodge for Cal Waddington in the summer of 1969 and this is her first trip back to the land of the midnight sun. Linda's daughter, Tandi Brown, works at Kwanlin Dun Health and Awareness Centre and has lived here for three years. So she has been here a few times, but none of the others have actually been this far north. I think all are having a wonderful time and enjoying themselves here and hopefully will come back.

So it gives me great pleasure to introduce Linda Brown, of Salmon Arm, British Columbia; my wife Micki Deuling-Kenyon who is obviously from Whitehorse, Porter Creek North; Patricia Joly of Nanaimo, British Columbia; Morag MacNeil of Victoria; Penny Margetson from Vancouver; Jo Pitura of Lake Country, British Columbia; Kathleen Primrose of Turner Valley, Alberta; and Susan Wells of Vernon, British Columbia. I ask the House to join me in welcoming them to the north.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any further introductions of visitors?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Speaker: Under tabling returns or documents, the Chair has for tabling a report of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly on subsistence, travel and accommodations of members of the Assembly during the 2009-10 fiscal year.

Are there any further returns or documents for tabling?

Are there any reports of committees?

Are there any petitions?

Any bills to be introduced?

Any notices of motion?

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to work with the public, including construction companies, tradespeople and their associations and homeowners to:

(1) develop a Yukon section of the Canada building code that would address issues unique to the northern environment and incorporate best building practices in terms of energy efficiency;

(2) develop and implement homeowner protection legislation and an effective home warranty program that would include mandatory licensing for contractors and homebuilders and uncomplicated recourses for the homebuyer in the event of structural or other defects in the new home or renovation project; and

(3) develop a system of licensing and accreditation for home inspections so that prospective homebuyers have adequate assurances of what they are purchasing.

Mr. Hardy: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following motion:

THAT the *Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly* be amended by adding the following Standing Order:

“45(3.5) A standing committee on Yukon government corporations and their wholly owned subsidiaries shall be appointed and that the committee have the authority to:

(a) inquire about current matters, future objectives and the past performance of Yukon government corporations and their wholly owned subsidiaries;

(b) make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly in order to ensure more open and accountable corporate governance and better corporate management;

(c) require Yukon government corporations and their wholly owned subsidiaries to submit reports to the Legislative Assembly in addition to annual reports of other significant transactions, which are defined as those that are material in amount and outside the ordinary course of business or are judged to be sensitive and likely of interest to legislators and the public; and

(d) conduct public hearings regarding Yukon government corporations and their wholly owned subsidiaries.

Mr. McRobb: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following motion:

THAT this House urges the Government of Yukon to practise a higher level of democracy in this House by not always controlling the agenda of identifying what matters are brought forward for debate and which aren't; and by complying with the requests from the majority of other members in this House who have identified they want to ensure that the Department of Environment is brought forward for adequate debate before the guillotine drops at 5:00 p.m. this Thursday.

Speaker: Any further notices of motion?

Is there a statement by a minister?

Hearing none, that brings us to Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Fiscal management

Mr. Mitchell: One of the traits of this government is that it doesn't like to take responsibility when things go wrong. The MLA for Lake Laberge put it best. He said the Premier will again, as always, use his standard approach of repeating the message of how everyone is wrong. The MLA for Lake Laberge was correct; that is the standard approach of the Premier and this entire government.

When the Auditor General of Canada criticizes this government, the Premier has dismissed it as just her opinion. There is fresh criticism of this government's handling of all things financial and it comes from the C.D. Howe Institute, one of Canada's leading independent policy research institutions. The Yukon received an "F" for financial management in their most recent report.

Does the Premier accept the criticism from the C.D. Howe Institute, or are they wrong as well?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, what this side of the House will accept is, once again, the Leader of the Official Opposition is somewhat carried away in the moment. The member opposite, the leader of the Liberals, should know — or I would hope knows — how the budgets are structured in Yukon.

The C.D. Howe Institute, by the way, provides rankings and comparisons that are all well and good, but unfortunately, sometimes these matters do not reflect regional differences. The preference of the C.D. Howe Institute is to compare budgets on a consolidated basis. Here's what the leader of the Liberals should know: the main estimates of the government as presented to the House exclude corporations like the Hospital Corporation and the college, and the comparison to our public accounts and/or year-end include said corporations; therefore, the comparison does not reflect what we could deem as an accurate picture.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, what a surprise, Mr. Speaker. The Premier refuses to accept responsibility. He's always right and everyone else is wrong.

When the Premier's \$36-million bad investment in ABCPs went south, he didn't accept responsibility for that either. The C.D. Howe Institute says this government does a poor job estimating revenues and a poor job estimating expenditures. Un-

fortunately for Yukoners, this government always ends up spending more than it says it will.

C.D. Howe ranked the provinces, the territories and the federal government, and we came 14th — dead last — when it comes to spending forecasts — dead last, Mr. Speaker.

Again, the C.D. Howe Institute is one of Canada's leading independent policy research institutions. Who should the public trust when it comes to financial information, the C.D. Howe Institute or the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I know this will be difficult for the leader of the Liberals to accept, but the leader is doing a very poor job with the facts. The fact of the matter is, if you do a comparison of the main estimates that do not include corporations like the Housing Corporation and Yukon College, to our public accounts — our year-end — which includes those corporations, one can obviously see there would be a discrepancy.

However, if we did the work — if the member opposite, the leader of the Liberals, actually sat down and did the work — and compared apples to apples, the member would then find a very high degree of accuracy. If we were to compare our mains to mains on an unconsolidated basis, the member knows full well there would be a high degree of accuracy, and if we were to compare our budgets on a basis that includes the corporations, the interesting part of that would show also a very high degree of accuracy. So the member opposite, the leader of the Liberals, does a very poor job of reflecting the facts.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are that this Premier is doing a very poor job with the finances. But perhaps he would like to volunteer to work with the C.D. Howe Institute and help them rewrite their reports.

Now, the C.D. Howe Institute says Yukon is dead last when it comes to spending forecasts. When it comes to forecasting revenue, we are 11th out of 14 — certainly nothing to write home about. Summarizing the findings of their report, a spokesperson for C.D. Howe had this to say about this government's performance: "The worst jurisdiction in the country, provinces and territories combined."

The report only covers the period up until 2009, so it doesn't even take into account the huge increase in spending and off-book borrowing the government has done in this year's budget. As this government goes for broke, it will be Yukon taxpayers who are left to pay the bills for years to come.

The C.D. Howe Institute has now added its voice to that of the Auditor General of Canada in criticizing this government's financial mismanagement.

Who should the public believe is correct — C.D. Howe and the Auditor General of Canada or this Premier?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: The Yukon Party government has done such a poor job with the finances that we're one of only two jurisdictions that today can state categorically that we have a net financial resource position versus a net debt position. In the whole country there are only two jurisdictions with that financial position — the Yukon and Alberta.

Now let me go back to the factual comparisons. If we were to do a comparison of our consolidated accounts, the member opposite would see for 2007-08 that the variance was a mere

\$7.4 million. That's comparing apples to apples, all inclusive, including the corporations.

In 2008-09, the member would see clearly that a mere \$3.1 million variance exists when you compare apples to apples, all inclusive, including the corporations. The member opposite knows that, so one can only draw this conclusion — there's something else motivating the leader of the Liberals.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Speaker: Mr. Mitchell, on a point of order,

Mr. Mitchell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Premier just indicated there's something else motivating. He's imputing a motive where there is none and 19(g) says that's out of order.

Speaker's ruling

Speaker: I agree there is a point of order. Hon. Premier, you know better than to do that. Presumably you have a new question, Leader of the Official Opposition.

Question re: Fiscal management

Mr. Mitchell: We have more questions about the Premier's bad report card from the C.D. Howe Institute — the worst jurisdiction in the country, provinces and territories combined, according to one of Canada's leading independent research institutes.

There was especially strong criticism for how this government reports its year-end spending in the Public Accounts. Again, the Yukon's grade in this part of the report is an "F". The author of the report says that the Yukon government uses different accounting practices for its budget and the year-end audited statements. The Premier actually admitted that earlier. He says that that makes it tough to track down the actual over-spending. This is a quote: "You can't actually tell what's going on clearly. In my opinion that is a real issue of obfuscation and it can be quite troubling."

It also says that the numbers in the public accounts don't match the numbers in the budget. If the Premier is doing so well, why does the C.D. Howe Institute have so much criticism for this government?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the short answer for the leader of the Liberals is that it is the difference between estimates and duly audited, actual figures. What a marvellous revelation for the leader of the Liberals. We actually do our books with the Auditor General's review and assessment, and of course the Auditor General reports on all fiscal matters of the Yukon.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this type of budgeting for the Yukon has gone on for decades. We do not present the main estimates that include corporations like the Hospital Corporation and the college. When the Auditor General reviews our books, all matters included — including corporations like the Hospital Corporation and the college — those books reflect the actual figures.

That has been the budgeting practice in the Yukon since I can remember, and it continues to be. The only way to change this — and this might help the member opposite — is change

how we present the main estimates. The member could do a great service to Yukoners and explain what position the leader of the Liberals would take on that matter. Would the member opposite, the leader of the Liberals, table main estimates, all-inclusive, that include the corporations?

Mr. Mitchell: How convenient that, when it suits the Premier, he cites the Auditor General, and when it doesn't, he dismisses her opinions. The Premier's budget figures don't match what's in the public accounts, and he expects the public to take his word that everything is A-okay with our finances. He's asking the public to take his word for it and, as we know, the public doesn't trust this government.

Another reason the Yukon Party got a failing grade is the violation of the *Financial Administration Act* through the purchase of non-bank ABCP, according to C.D. Howe. The C.D. Howe Institute also points out the public accounts are always late, because of late submissions of key documents. This is the case right now in Yukon. Last year's books are still not signed off, because the government was late getting reports to the Auditor General of Canada.

What changes will the government be making to improve its performance, or is it content to be ranked 14th out of 14, in terms of financial management in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, actually it is quite laughable, all things considered. In terms of the member opposite's view of the financial position of the Yukon, we'll leave that to the leader of the Liberal's to explain. The financial position of the Yukon is really quite healthy. The member knows full well, when he makes mention of the Yukon Housing Corporation, that all other financial matters of the government were duly audited by the Auditor General, and there are no other issues. The member fails to represent that to Yukoners; that is a bit of a problem. Furthermore, again, the member should be clear with Yukoners. Would the Liberals in fact table budgets — main estimates — that include corporations like the Hospital Corporation and the Yukon College or not? Because past Liberal governments, NDP governments, Yukon Party governments have never done that. This House debates fiscal matters that the government is responsible for. Corporations like the Hospital Corporation and the college have a board that is responsible for those fiscal matters. So, Mr. Speaker, the member should explain that to Yukoners. Would the Liberals table main estimates including the corporations?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is fond of answering a question with a question, but I'll ask the questions here and he should try some answers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's responses today are as we expected them to be: everyone else is wrong; the Auditor General of Canada is wrong; the C.D. Howe Institute is wrong; the Official Opposition, of course, is wrong.

We've been saying for years this government is spending more than it's taking in, and the report from C.D. Howe confirms that. We have expressed concern about the Premier's investments in ABCPs, and the C.D. Howe Institute has echoed those same concerns. We've been saying for years the government does a poor job reporting to the public on financial issues, and the report echoes those concerns, as well.

The Yukon Party government is driving the finances of this territory off a cliff with its poor fiscal management. It's going for broke as we approach the next election.

Instead of lashing out that everyone else is wrong, when is the Premier going to start taking responsibility for his actions?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: The one thing I will agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party on is the Official Opposition has been wrong, continues to be wrong and will be wrong into the future, because they don't come clean with Yukoners and explain what they would do. The budgeting matter, the member knows full well what the issue is here. He knows the difference between main estimates and actual figures of a consolidated nature in our public accounts. The Leader of the Liberal Party knows that, yet will not explain that to Yukoners.

The member asks what we do. Instead of running around blaming people for things, we actually do things to help people.

When the Yukon Housing Corporation found it difficult to complete their year-end, the government sent Finance officials over to help the Housing Corporation. When Finance officials, in making investments, were reflecting past practices that decades of governments had been allowing, this government didn't lay blame; this government went ahead and developed a policy that ensures that those officials are no longer encumbered with this matter.

We have done something, Mr. Speaker and, in all that we've done, how is the Yukon now positioned financially? It's one of the only two jurisdictions with a net financial resource position versus net debt.

I don't know how the leader of the Liberals does his calculations, but they're wrong.

Question re: Fiscal management

Mr. Hardy: Now here we are at the last week of the sitting and it appears that it will end as it started, with serious questions about this government's management of the public purse.

The C.D. Howe study on fiscal accountability looks at 10 years of government spending between 1999 and 2009, encompassing one year of an NDP government, a few years of the Liberal government and two terms of Mr. Fentie's government. This study paints an extremely disturbing picture. It says the Yukon is the worst of all governments — territorial, provincially or federally — at budgeting. When it comes to budgeting revenues and spending, the study says expectations are hugely out of whack with reality. When a person's perceptions are so out of whack with reality, they are called "delusional", Mr. Speaker. So how is the government going to respond to these charges of delusional financial management —

Speaker's statement

Speaker: Thank you. And honourable member, please don't mention members by name.

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Actually, I thank the member of the Third Party for his question and his articulation of 10 years of this practice. You know, at least the Third Party reflects factually what is going on. Yes, for 10 years the Yukon government, all governments — NDP, Liberal or otherwise — have tabled

main estimates that do not include the corporations. That is very important here, Mr. Speaker, because it is the difference between day and night. C.D. Howe prefers to analyze these matters on a consolidated basis, which then would include those corporations. So there is a distinct difference here, Mr. Speaker.

The important factor is this — that the C.D. Howe Institute did not reflect the financial position of the Yukon government, which is the same as Alberta's: no net debt, Mr. Speaker; in fact, a healthy net financial resource position. That is called real, solid fiscal management, because that's where the Yukon Party government has brought this territory financially. It has brought it into a modern age where we have some opportunity, some options, and we are investing in a very healthy way in the Yukon Territory on behalf of Yukon citizens.

Mr. Hardy: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little concerned how our credit rating will be affected when you get think tanks like this making these kinds of statements. I hope the Premier, if he is so confident, will talk to them and straighten it out.

The study says that, over this period, there was \$500 million in cost overruns. That's what it used to cost to run the territory, Mr. Speaker. It boggles the mind, the amount of money we're talking about here. Every year the study looked at, from 1999 to 2009, except for one year, the Yukon government spent more than it said it would. At the start of the sitting, despite evidence to the contrary, the Premier denied there was a deficit for last fiscal year. He also said there would be no deficit for this fiscal year, despite a paper-thin projected surplus and unrealistic projections for the Health budget.

Will the Premier admit that this year will be no exception and that, like every year of his government save one, he will spend more than he planned and engage in deficit spending for the second year in a row?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to try to debate with individuals who actually just refuse to understand that the most important element of the budget for the Yukon is its net financial resource position. That's critical in this matter, Mr. Speaker, because that's the true picture of the Yukon government finances.

The member opposite also heard me articulate this: if we compared apples to apples, in other words, did a consolidated comparison — public accounts to public accounts — on that basis, the actual variance in 2007-08 is a mere \$7.4 million. That's a minimal variance. That shows how solid the fiscal management really is because those are audited numbers by the Auditor General. It also shows in 2008-09, a mere \$3.1 million variance. That again demonstrates solid financial management because that number is duly audited by the Auditor General. It's the real figure, Mr. Speaker, not the member's interpretation of some report they've suddenly read because it arrived on their desk.

Mr. Hardy: One of the report's authors had this to say about Yukon finances: "You can't actually tell what's going on clearly. In my opinion that's a real issue of obfuscation and it can be quite troubling." The report goes on to say, for governments seeking to reassure voters of their capacity to restore budget balance and long-term fiscal sustainability, better re-

porting and improved oversight to achieve stricter adherence to budget targets should be a priority. I think we all agree with that in here.

What we need is more legislative oversight of the public purse through a stronger role for Public Accounts or through new standing committees. Everything needs to be on the table: how we budget; our accounting practices; when we decide to borrow for project financing. We must ultimately democratize the budgetary process and engage in long-term planning so the public is part of setting the priorities within the context of fiscal responsibility.

So my question: will the Premier commit to this direction of greater oversight, greater controls and planning to get our fiscal house in order?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: First off, I take issue with the fact that the member from the Third Party suggests that the fiscal house is out of order, because that is inconsistent with the fact of the matter, that the Yukon is in a net financial resource position versus the rest of the country — save and except Alberta — which has a net debt position. That demonstrates a fiscal house in order.

As far as C.D. Howe, Finance officials have talked to them as recently as this morning. C.D. Howe does now admit that lumping the Yukon in with the other territories is, in fact, inappropriate. So already there's a demonstration by the institute itself to recognize the disparities and the differences in this country.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the member knows that the public accounts are audited by the Auditor General. The member knows that you couldn't get more clear, open, transparent books to present to the Yukon public. It is called the public accounts and we are very comfortable with the work the Auditor General does. There is a difference, however, here in Yukon in comparison to other jurisdictions. Our budgets, as tabled — the main estimates — do not include certain corporations. However, our public accounts do. Therein lies the issue.

Question re: Committees of the Legislative Assembly

Mr. Hardy: I read a motion into the record today calling for the creation of a legislative committee on Yukon government corporations and their wholly owned subsidiaries. Our government corporations are spending and borrowing record amounts of money and this is of increasing concern to taxpayers who will have to bear these costs. Our government corporations do not get the scrutiny in this Legislature that they deserve, considering the millions upon millions of dollars that they are responsible for — and this should be a concern for all of us sitting in the House.

So what can we as legislators do to ensure more open and accountable corporate governance and better corporate management? One approach — and this is being used by a number of Canadian provinces today — is to have a legislative committee on government corporations.

Does this government agree that a standing committee on Yukon government corporations would help improve accountability to the public?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the member of the Third Party that there are all kinds of possibili-

ties to improve things. In fact, for the last eight years, that's what the Yukon Party government has actually been doing — improving, in many areas. I see the Member for Kluane thinks it's funny, but at least we're not paying interest on the money we need to pay our employees' wages, as we were under the Liberals' financial management — not.

Furthermore, to the member's question about committees, the one thing I would respond with is, are we sure we won't leak sensitive, confidential and private information?

Mr. Hardy: Mr. Speaker, I think everybody in the House knows who leaked that information. I can assure you it wasn't us.

The provinces of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and New Brunswick have legislative committees that provide broad oversight for government corporations. These committees play a crucial role in ensuring government corporations act in an accountable and responsible manner that conforms to their mandates. Are their actual and intended performances set out in a clear comparison? Are financial and non-financial performance measures provided to give an integrated and balanced picture of intended performance?

These are just a couple of the key reporting principles such a committee would consider in its deliberations, discussions and reports.

When will this government take steps to create a legislative committee that will provide proper oversight for our government corporations and their wholly owned entities?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: The jurisdictions the member of the Third Party just presented to the House are jurisdictions with a net debt. I don't know how else we can explain that to the opposition members of this House. That's a critical matter. There are nine provinces and two territories in this country that are actually in a net debt position. There are only two jurisdictions that are not: Yukon and Alberta. That says a lot about accountability, about fiscal management, about the approach the Yukon Party government has taken with the finances of the territory.

Furthermore, the member is continuing to refer to accountability. How can the member diminish the role of board members on the Yukon Development Corporation Board, for example? How can the member diminish the role of the Yukon Hospital Corporation Board and its members? How can the member diminish the role of the board members who oversee Yukon College?

These Yukoners, these citizens, who have the full support of this Yukon Party government, provide the oversight for those corporations and they do a masterful job.

Mr. Hardy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Premier that they're accountable to the people of the Yukon Territory — absolutely. I don't care who is sitting on the boards. They're still accountable to the taxpayers of the Yukon. In the Yukon, our government corporations report to the Legislature once a year, if we are lucky, and then we only get two hours to question their officials. This is not nearly enough time when we're talking about total assets of \$364 million — that's not including the Mayo B project — yearly total revenues of \$141 million and yearly total expenses of \$129 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, year after year, these government corporations fail to get called by the government when we debate departmental budgets. Again, where is the accountability back to the people? It also says for governments seeking to reassure voters of their capacity to restore budget balance and long-term financial sustainability, better reporting — sorry, I'll drop that section. It was from C.D. Howe.

The question is: does the government agree that a standing committee on government corporations would be one good way to achieve reporting?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me make this point. The members of the aforementioned boards are accountable to the Yukon public, and they demonstrate that on an on-going basis.

Second, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the member opposite that there are a number of legislative committees that function today, not the least of which is the Public Accounts Committee that didn't function for approximately a decade. It is this Yukon Party government that actually endeavoured to get the Public Accounts Committee back up and running and functioning as it should. There are all kinds of possibilities that can come out of joint legislative committees. They are in our Standing Orders.

However, Mr. Speaker, recently there has been an example of concern and a demonstration of a major problem here, and that is leaking what could be confidential and private information outside of those committees. Mr. Speaker, we can create all the committees we want — accountability is not measured by what you leak to the media.

Question re: Environmental safety

Mr. Elias: The world is watching the catastrophic oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico and it has been on the forefront of many minds around the world, including here at home. Yukoners are worried about our north coast. Twenty-four hours a day, for 25 days now, 5,000 barrels, or 800,000 litres of oil are flowing into the ocean per day. That oil is killing the fish, marine mammals and birds in the area, and it has already devastated people's livelihoods.

Down in Louisiana, there are certain areas they are already calling "the dead zone", and the cleanup is estimated at \$12.5 billion.

One-quarter of the globe's oil reserves are predicted to be in the Arctic, so I guess we should get our act together. It is unimaginable what a similar disaster could do in the Canadian Arctic, and we cannot take the risk of it happening here. Yukoners want to know what this government is doing to ensure this kind of environmental disaster never happens in our Arctic waters.

Hon. Mr. Rouble: This is a very important question, not only to Yukoners but to people in the circumpolar nations, as well as people around the world. We've all looked at the — there's no better word to describe it, other than — disaster that has been created in the south and the impacts it has had on the environment there — and we're still finding out all the reasons that have caused this incident to happen.

The Government of Yukon takes this situation very seriously and we will continue to work with the federal govern-

ment, through the Canada-Yukon oil and gas accord, which was signed between Yukon and Canada and which deals with the issues of gas in the Beaufort Sea area. We'll also work with the federal government on the areas of regulation to ensure that Canada regulates this industry, as it should, in order to provide protection of our resources and protection of our environment.

Mr. Elias: If there ever ends up to be a network of oil rigs in the Arctic, history alone proves that it's not a matter of "if", it's a matter of "when" that we're dealing with a similar type of incident that is happening in the Gulf of Mexico.

It's not enough for our Yukon government to rely on Ottawa alone to set the rules on Arctic policy to protect our northern tide waters and marine ecosystems. This issue warrants unity, Mr. Speaker. It warrants a pan-northern approach. It warrants the unification of the Arctic Council and submissions to the National Energy Board. We need to take our Arctic back and send a message that rolling the dice in our Arctic is simply unacceptable.

Yukoners want to be sure that no oil extraction will take place without sufficient safeguards. What requirements — above and beyond those already set federally — will this government either put in place, or advocate for, to protect our Arctic coastline?

Hon. Mr. Fentie: I don't think anyone in this House, in the territory, in the country or around the world would disagree that what's happening in the Gulf of Mexico today is one of the most devastating events the global environment has ever experienced and no one yet knows what the outcome will be.

Speaking of our Arctic environment and the sensitivities there, the minister has just articulated that we have a role to play with our federal government. But I'm also glad the member brought up the Arctic Council. As recently as last week, in our meetings and deliberations with the Arctic Council permanent participants, with the three northern premiers, we have agreed that we will pursue an initiative on a pan-northern basis with the Arctic Council so that we are better able to influence the federal government's foreign and domestic policies in the Arctic region all-inclusive, this one being of the highest priority.

Mr. Elias: No one, no company, has ever attempted a cleanup effort or a relief effort that's going on in the Gulf of Mexico in Arctic waters, Mr. Speaker. That's why this is so important.

Several oil companies already hold exploration leases for large tracts of the Beaufort Sea. Among them is the company responsible for the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. We need stringent safety requirements in place before they move forward with drilling. British Petroleum has submitted a proposal to the National Energy Board to bypass the drilling of relief wells as a safety measure when working in the Beaufort Sea.

Why should Canada ease any regulation in the Arctic when it comes to oil and gas development? Just the other day the CEO of British Petroleum, Tony Hayward said, "The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico is 'relatively tiny' compared to a 'very big ocean'".

Mr. Speaker, this is the attitude that Yukoners recognize and understand. How will this government protect Yukon's northern shores from an Arctic oil disaster?

Hon. Mr. Rouble: Mr. Speaker, this government takes this issue very seriously. We take our issue of protecting and ensuring a sustainable environment very seriously as well. It was just last week that this issue was brought forward once again with Arctic Council members. Mr. Speaker, I can assure all Yukoners that the Government of Yukon will work very closely with the federal government. This is an issue that is regulated through the National Energy Board. They are conducting rigorous investigations into this issue right now. We recognize the work that they are doing and the safeguards that they are putting in place to ensure that we have appropriate regulatory regimes for these types of issues throughout all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, in Yukon we will also work to ensure that we have appropriate regulatory regimes to ensure the protection of Yukon's resources, our livelihood and the environment.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Ms. Taylor: I move that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and 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 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. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We are now continuing with line-by-line debate in Department of Community Services.

Do members wish to take a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

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

Bill No. 20 — *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11* — continued

Chair: The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with Vote 51. We are on line "domestic well program" on page 6-9. We will now continue with line debate on domestic well program of \$600,000. Mr. Lang, you have approximately 19 minutes left on that line.

Department of Community Services — continued
On Capital Expenditures — continued

On Domestic Well Program — continued

Hon. Mr. Lang: I would like to thank the staff here, who are supporting me this afternoon. On this line item there is \$600,000, which was a program that was put together by this government. Our rural investment is what individuals make for access to wells. We could put that under the same heading as we did our energy program. So it has been very well received in the outlying areas.

We also changed the *Municipal Act*, so for any municipality that wants to go work with the program, it's available for them too. So that is a decision those governments would have to make.

It is very well received in the outlying areas and it has certainly grown over the years. The individuals who take advantage of this program have some flexibility on paying it back. It's not set on a set-year thing. They have options between 10 or 15 or 20. Those payments come due on their taxes and, of course, it is paid over the set period of time that they've signed up for.

It makes the options for people who live in rural residential areas and in our unincorporated community — it gives them the flexibility to, in some cases, get off the water hauling, which is an ongoing expense for the individuals and certainly isn't as reliable as having your own source of water, which this well program supplies. It's a great program, Mr. Chair, and it's something that was asked of us by Yukoners — if we could as a government see our way clear to put a program together and, of course, we've done that. I think it has been about four or five years that the program has been in place and certainly it has been well received and is doing the job that it was set out to do, Mr. Chair.

Domestic Well Program in the amount of \$600,000 agreed to

On Public Libraries

On Community Library Development Projects

Community Library Development Projects in the amount of \$35,000 agreed to

On Community Operations

On Water and Sewer Mains

Water and Sewer Mains in the amount of \$75,000 agreed to

On Solid Waste

Mr. Cardiff: As the minister well knows, this is an item that's near and dear to my heart — the issue about solid-waste management and the discontinuation of burning of solid waste throughout the Yukon. Could the minister give us a breakdown, obviously, because he will do that anyhow on this line item — the \$320,000? Can he tell us what progress — are we still on schedule to stop the burning of waste in all Yukon communities sometime soon?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The funding of \$320,000 consists of three projects. It improves the regulatory compliance at \$150,000, which includes electric fencing, signage, trenching and site expansion at territorial solid-waste facilities; facility

land tenure at \$20,000 to complete an inventory of land tenure for all Community Development branch facilities and apply for land transfer of those sites on federal land reserves; perform legal surveys, as required; and \$150,000 for the solid-waste strategy implementation plan, which was a document I tabled here in the House, and it is a go-forward plan on how this government sees the expansion or the progression into the no-burning bylaws, or — 2012 is the date we have to meet.

The member opposite was talking about where we're at with the 2012 date. We're very comfortable with that date. Having the date makes it easier for us to make our decisions. We have to be in a position to have no-burn by 2012, so we're moving forward with managing our solid waste.

As you can see, through the *Solid Waste Action Plan* that we put together, we're moving in phases to incorporate Deep Creek, Marsh Lake, Johnson's Crossing, and then we have Mount Lorne, Carcross and Tagish. Those areas are being addressed at the moment. We're moving into the Haines Junction area next, and that will be looking at Burwash Landing, Beaver Creek, Destruction Bay, Silver City and, of course, Canyon Creek and Champagne. So that will be the next area we are tackling, and then we're moving in to the Mayo and Carmacks area. Mayo — that would consist of Keno City, Mayo and Stewart Crossing.

A lot of the municipalities in these small areas have had the responsibility of managing solid waste for their area for many years. Mayo, as an example, Mr. Chair, has been actually managing the surrounding solid waste, whether it is Keno City or whether it is the First Nation, or whether it is the mining community around it. They have been doing the job over the last period of time and certainly that has to be addressed at the cost for small communities.

Carmacks is looking at Braeburn and Pelly Crossing and how we are going to work with them to manage that solid waste. Dawson City also has an issue and, of course, we have to modernize the Old Crow facility, so all of these things are moving forward. Certainly, if you were to go through the action plan here, it's step by step in how we do it. I'm looking forward to 2012 when we actually have our solid waste plan implemented. I'm very confident we can do it in the time frame that has been put together.

As I said to the member opposite, sometimes it's better to have a drop-dead date and work toward that than to have something loose where, at the end of the day, we might be able to finish it or we're looking at a longer date. All the reports that I have are that it is on time and on budget.

I would like to compliment the individuals who are working on it. They're doing a stellar job on the ground. I was in Carmacks, not this weekend but last weekend, and they're very happy with the transfer station that we put there. There are things that we have to do to improve that, but the fact that we don't burn there any more is such a breath of fresh air for everybody in the area.

It is certainly being received well in the communities that we have been working with. At the end of the day, it will manage solid waste throughout the Yukon.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that answer. I'd like to know what the date is in 2012 — if it's January 1 or later. This is a huge undertaking. The minister just mentioned that there is a transfer station in Carmacks. The way that I understood it, there would be waste transferred to regional dumps or solid-waste facilities where the solid waste can be dealt with in a manner that doesn't threaten the environment. If that means a landfill, there will be cells created that have impermeable liners, so that when water leaches through the solid waste that is being buried in those cells, it doesn't enter the groundwater. That's one issue.

I didn't realize that Carmacks was going to be a transfer station. Maybe the minister can clarify that when he gets on his feet next. Is it a transfer station or is it going to be one of the facilities that actually receives solid waste from other communities and is a regional facility?

The issue of Old Crow — it just seems to me, Mr. Chair, that \$320,000 to address an issue of this importance — there must be money elsewhere in the budget to deal with this. I don't have the figures in front of me, but I know that there has been an agreement reached with the City of Whitehorse on a per-tonne basis to take solid waste from communities outside of Whitehorse. I believe those are Mount Lorne, Carcross, Tagish and Marsh Lake. I believe the minister referred to Johnsons Crossing and Teslin, which are both going to be transferring their solid waste to the Whitehorse landfill.

It sounds like Deep Creek and Ibez Valley will also be transporting their waste to the Whitehorse landfill, and there are costs associated with that. I don't see where those costs are reflected in the budget. Now maybe they were in the operation and maintenance, and maybe the minister could clarify that, but this is an important issue.

The other community that the minister raised is Old Crow. I am sure the minister has seen pictures. It has been brought to my attention, and I know that the Member for Vuntut Gwitchin brought this to the minister's attention last year in Question Period and in this debate — the dump there actually needs to be relocated, because it is too close to the river and there is water flowing through the facility and into the river.

Now the minister is saying that he's confident that this is all going to happen by 2012 — that's what I heard him say — that all of our solid-waste problems and the cessation of burning and dealing effectively with our solid waste in Yukon communities is going to be taken care of by 2012.

\$320,000 seems to be kind of a paltry sum in order to do that, if we're talking about moving landfill facilities in Old Crow, and if we're dealing with the transferring of waste from one community to the other, which is something I actually support. If it stops the burning, and stops polluting the atmosphere and the water and affecting wildlife, I think that's a good thing — and if we contain it and deal with it. I believe that's a good idea.

I have posed a number of issues for the minister. I'll sit down and await his response. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Going back to Carmacks being a transfer, Carmacks is responsible for its own solid-waste man-

agement. I was talking about Carcross — I maybe misspoke, but we're responsible.

The transfers we've done now include Carcross and Tagish, Marsh Lake, Mount Lorne and Deep Creek. Those alone account for 80 percent of our solid waste in the territory, so our biggest focus right now is that area. That is 80 percent of the total tonnage of solid waste in our outlying communities, so it is the biggest customer. As far as Carmacks being a municipality, that makes them more responsible for their solid waste, but we work with them on that issue. Mayo is the same thing. It is a municipality, so it manages its own solid waste.

We as a government work with municipalities. We understand that potable water issues and solid-waste issues encumber these small communities because there's a cost to all this and how they manage that cost. That's very important for us as a department — to make sure that our communities can manage the potable water or the solid waste or waste water, so they can do it in a financially beneficial way.

A lot of these obligations are put on by senior government. We have been working with the First Nation. Some of the resources will come from Building Canada. Old Crow will benefit from that, and we're working with the First Nation there to make these decisions like the member opposite was talking about — whether it should be moved and how it will be managed in the future. Again, the no-burn policy will be in place. Definitely, I don't have to see pictures of the Old Crow solid-waste management; I have been there many, many times. It is one of the things that we monitor, and we work with the First Nation. As the member opposite was saying, we are managing the actual site itself and monitoring the water table to make sure the solid wastes aren't polluting the water table. That is another obligation on our municipalities — you know, Mayo and Carmacks and of course, Dawson City. They all have the added cost of monitoring the water table to make sure that leakage from the solid-waste operation isn't affecting the underground water. Those things are all costs to communities.

That's probably one of the reasons we as a government moved forward with that municipal workshop we'll be doing over the next 12 months to try to get a lid on some of these costs that are creeping up on our municipalities. It's not just what the economics of the community are or what our transfers are, or the amount; it's what the cost of managing all these infrastructures is to these communities. We've been working. Certainly solid waste will be one of the cost factors that we'll have to talk about as a group.

Of course, there is the wastewater issue in our communities, and then there are the other costs of running a community in a modern way. We'll be going over that in the next 12 months so that we can come up with some findings that we can work with to put a new plan before our municipalities to say, "Okay, this is a go-forward plan that we can see as the senior government and the resources need to be in place to do that."

So that's exactly why we triggered the conversation with AYC, with the municipalities — to have that discussion over the next 12 months and get some findings so we can make some pertinent decisions.

Some of these resources come from Building Canada. The municipalities have the flexibility of the gas tax, and they have their own private resources, so it doesn't mean we don't work with them on this issue. This issue is not only an obligation of the municipality, but it's a large education program for the individuals in the municipality. A lot of these, like the potable water issue, solid waste and all of this is a learning experience for the municipalities.

We understand the situation in the municipalities, but, in turn, we are committed, by July 1, 2012, to have a no-burn policy in place. We're quite comfortable with that date.

Old Crow, as we all know, is very remote. How do we manage solid waste there, in partnership with the First Nation? Those questions have to be answered. How do you answer them? You work in partnership and, as the member opposite was asking, is there the appetite to move the solid waste site from where it is?

There are a couple of issues with the Old Crow solid-waste site. It's not only the issue about drainage. Of course, that is being monitored. In some cases, in the spring, there can be flooding in that area.

To have a solid-waste management unit in a location that might be flooded every three or four years is not good business, so we're working with the First Nation, but we as a government are conscious of that. The First Nation is conscious of it, and they understand the urgency of getting a solid-waste management plan together for their community. I look forward to working with them over the next two years to put that in place.

They're very positive about this and they are treating it very seriously, and we are too. I think, at the end of the day, with both governments working on this, we should be able to get something in place for Old Crow that will solve the drainage problem, the flooding problem and all the issues they've had in the past.

Again, the date for the no-burning is July 1, 2012, and we are looking forward to that.

Mr. Cardiff: I'm dismayed — I guess that is the word that I would use — that this is an issue that has been raised for a number of years now. I'm pleased to see progress, but I'm just dismayed at the rate of progress.

The minister stood up and said that there is not going to be a solution to the Old Crow situation for another two years. He also, in the same breath, said that there are flooding issues and that they have to work with the First Nation. To me, I agree that that has to be done, but this is an issue of public health and public safety. We've already debated the Department of Health and Social Services, so it can't be raised as a public health and safety issue, but I think that it would behoove the minister to speed up the process on this. While I agree that you need to work with communities, sometimes you need to lead. This is an issue that requires leadership on the part of the government for the overall public health and safety of all Yukon citizens. It would strike me that the minister should not be happy or satisfied that it is going to take another two years to address this important issue.

The other thing I asked the minister about is the line item for \$320,000. I recognize there is some work being done and

that it is Building Canada money. The other question I asked the minister is with regard to these transfer stations. The minister either misspoke himself when citing the community or I misunderstood. I recognize Carcross has a new transfer station and Tagish does as well. I am pleased to see that and I know that the residents of those communities are pleased to see that and the cessation of burning there. What I asked the minister was about the agreements that have been reached with Whitehorse to accept that and what the cost of that is, and whether or not — as the minister quite rightly stated — municipalities are responsible for the solid waste in their communities. They need to be provided assistance in order to make sure they are compliant with what it is that the government is saying needs to happen.

The other thing is, if you are going to transfer solid waste from other unincorporated communities into those municipalities, there also needs to be — regardless of the amount, which is something those municipalities will have to deal with — some sort of an agreement on a per-tonne basis in order for them to accept the solid waste that is being transferred in and the additional responsibility and additional pressure that it places on their facility, so they can adequately deal with it. The facilities aren't there for a lifetime.

Eventually they fill up and you need to build another one. The municipality needs to know that it has the funds or the support of a government to do that. That was all part of what the people travelling around the territory did. They looked at all of that. It was a good exercise that addressed a really important problem. Are those agreements with the municipalities that will be accepting solid waste from unincorporated communities from dumps that are operated by the Department of Community Services, the government — are their agreements going to be negotiated? Are they in the process? Or are they going to be entered into some time soon?

There was one other issue I wanted to raise with the minister around solid waste. It seems to have slipped my mind, but I'll sit down and I'm sure it will come back to me.

Hon. Mr. Lang: We do have an agreement and a letter of understanding with the City of Whitehorse. We pay \$75 a tonne for sorted refuse. At the moment we are working with the city. Right now, Mr. Chair, we're conducting a targeted discussion with municipalities and communities. In addition to establishing the Yukon's solid-waste committee, which is a committee we're forming to oversee this, the Department of Community Services will work directly with municipalities and communities to identify opportunities to partner and share resources to meet specific community needs. We're doing exactly that right now as we speak. This government — the government of the day — would not think about unloading these responsibilities on a community and expecting them to manage our responsibilities without some benefit of costs. That will be covered in this dialogue that we're having now.

As far as Old Crow is concerned and what we've done in the past and what we're doing now — the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation has identified a number of concerns with the lagoon and landfill. Community Services staff worked with the First Nation in November 2009 and again in March 2010 and

will be attending the communities this spring to actively work toward the development of plans to implement the solid-waste strategy in Old Crow focusing on education, recycling, waste handling and diversion. The First Nation has also expressed the desire for a contaminated soil reclamation area, so we are working with them.

Some of the work that will be completed this year will revolve around better management of household hazardous waste, better management of our batteries and metals until such time as a winter road is developed and these materials can be removed from the community. In other words, we're going to marshal all that solid waste that we can take out this coming winter when a winter road is put in. All of that will be back-hauled out of the community.

A contract has been issued for engineering work to be completed on the water infrastructure to assess how best to improve the chlorine contact time, wellhead protection, and iron and manganese concerns. In other words, this is at the wellhead in Old Crow and we will be looking to encourage conservation and sustainability when we review the water delivery and sewage education agreements. We're working on every level with the First Nation. We will be looking at the practicability of water diversion around the lagoon from the hillside to ensure continued integrity of the lagoon system.

Those are all things we're doing in the community of Old Crow, working with the First Nation. As far as our *Yukon Solid Waste Action Plan* is concerned, if the member opposite had his copy and walked through it, he would see that we're focusing on this and putting together the solid-waste committee. I think the membership is in the process of being finalized. We have names and individuals who have come forward to sit on this committee and they will be an important part of this too.

This will be the most important part of the committee's work and this government's work — how we handle our solid waste into the future. We are committed to July of 2012, and that's the date we're looking toward to make sure, at the end of the day, we can manage our solid waste in an appropriate way.

*Solid Waste in the amount of \$320,000 agreed to
On Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade*

Mr. Cardiff: Can the minister give us a breakdown of where the money is being spent?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Roads, bridges and streets upgrade — there's funding of \$100,000 for one project. \$100,000 is for improvements of roads in various communities and emergency projects in various communities as they arise and to develop a long-term plan and cost estimate for upgrading in our unincorporated areas to a standard that meets Transportation Association of Canada's guidelines. We have a responsibility in our unincorporated communities to invest in the streets in those communities and that's what this money will do.

Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to

On Prior Years' Projects

Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

Community Development in the amount of \$3,714,000 agreed to

On Infrastructure Development

On Community Infrastructure

On Project Management

*Project Management in the amount of \$976,000 agreed to
On Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements —
Ross River Water Treatment*

Mr. Cardiff: Can the minister tell us if this is the end of this project or is there work to be done in future years?

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is the end of the infrastructure money for repairs and improvements for the Ross River water treatment and fire hall truck storage building. This would be the end of the project.

Mr. Cardiff: The reason I am asking the question, Mr. Chair, is because if you look at the comparables, right next to this line item, there was originally, a year ago, three-quarters of a million dollars budgeted. It looks like the forecast is that there would only be, of that three-quarters of a million dollars, \$50,000 spent. Now we have \$250,000 committed this year. I am just wondering: did the scope of the project change? Did we get some new information or did the government change the scope of the project so that it came in cheaper?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Some of the money was profiled through Building Canada, so it was redirected into Building Canada.

Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements — Ross River Water Treatment in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to

*On Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements —
Prior Years' Projects*

Infrastructure Major Repairs and Improvements — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

On Water and Sewer Mains — Destruction Bay Water and Sewer

Water and Sewer Mains — Destruction Bay Water and Sewer in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to

On Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Burwash Sewage Lagoon

Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Burwash Sewage Lagoon in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to

On Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Old Crow Sewage Treatment

Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Old Crow Sewage Treatment in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to

On Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Prior Years' Projects

Sewage Treatment and Disposal — Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

On Flood/Erosion Control

Mr. Cardiff: Could the minister give us an idea of which communities and which projects are being done under this?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That's the Zircon Lane investment and that's the cost to connect the receiving ditch to the city main, so that \$400,000 covers one project.

Chair: Is there any further debate?

Mr. Cardiff: Actually, Mr. Chair, I do have — no, I'll pass.

Flood/Erosion Control in the amount of \$400,000 agreed to

On Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Hamilton Boulevard

Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Hamilton Boulevard in the amount of \$500,000 agreed to

On Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Miles Canyon Suspension Bridge

Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Miles Canyon Suspension Bridge in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to

On Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Ross River Suspension Bridge

Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Ross River Suspension Bridge in the amount of \$600,000 agreed to

On Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Prior Years' Projects

Roads, Bridges and Streets Upgrade – Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

On Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Carcross Waterfront

Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Carcross Waterfront in the amount of \$1,600,000 agreed to

On Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Whitehorse Waterfront

Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Whitehorse Waterfront in the amount of \$2,000,000 agreed to

On Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Kwanlin Dun Cultural Centre

Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund Projects – Kwanlin Dun Cultural Centre in the amount of \$10,300,000 agreed to

On Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Haines Junction Water Supply Improvements

Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Haines Junction Water Supply Improvements in the amount of \$200,000 agreed to

On Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Little Salmon First Nation Water Supply Fill Station

Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Little Salmon First Nation Water Supply Fill Station in the amount of \$1,133,000 agreed to

On Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Champagne and Aishihik First Nations Cultural Centre

Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Champagne and Aishihik First Nations Cultural Centre in the amount of \$6,611,000 agreed to

On Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Prior Years' Projects

Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund Projects – Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

On Building Canada Fund – Dawson City Sewage Treatment and District Heating

Mr. Cardiff: I have two questions for the minister. When was the decision made to incorporate a district heating system into this project, and what is the total cost of the project? I guess the other question about the district heating system related to this is this: which buildings are going to be heated through this district heating system, and what effect will it have on permafrost?

Hon. Mr. Lang: This was Building Canada-driven. This is \$12.8 million for the sewage treatment and \$4 million for the district heating. I guess, in answering the question about what buildings it will heat, I would be more comfortable if that were asked during debate on Highways and Public Works. We're responsible for the job in Highways and Public Works, but we're working for Community Services. So when we get to Highways and Public Works, we'll be able to answer those questions better than we can under Community Services.

Building Canada Fund – Dawson City Sewage Treatment and District Heating in the amount of \$16,800,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Marsh Lake Intake and Fill System

Building Canada Fund – Marsh Lake Intake and Fill System in the amount of \$700,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Carmacks Sewage Treatment

Building Canada Fund – Carmacks Sewage Treatment in the amount of \$1,521,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Arsenic Treatment Upgrades

Building Canada Fund – Arsenic Treatment Upgrades in the amount of \$3,410,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Ross River System Upgrades and Arsenic Treatment

Building Canada Fund – Ross River System Upgrades and Arsenic Treatment in the amount of \$1,100,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Carcross Water System Upgrade

Building Canada Fund – Carcross Water System Upgrade in the amount of \$1,450,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Old Crow Roadway

Mr. Cardiff: Could the minister tell us if this is the winter road project he was referring to earlier?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is not the winter road. This \$1.4 million, phase 1, will include a crushing program to produce the necessary gravel to complete an overlay on the roads and regrading of existing ditches. That's the breakdown, as we see it today.

Building Canada Fund – Old Crow Roadway in the amount of \$1,400,000 agreed to

On Building Canada Fund – Planning and Administration

Mr. Cardiff: This is a line item that's associated with the Building Canada fund. Could the minister explain the \$4.5 million expenditure for planning and administration?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The biggest part of that — the \$3.3 million — is a planning initiative allocation to projects approved under the 2009-10 and 2010-11 annual capital plan. These are resources put together so we can plan into the future for the next two years. These are the resources for that.

Building Canada Fund – Planning and Administration in the amount of \$4,532,000 agreed to

On Prior Years' Projects

Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

On Land Development

On Industrial

Mr. Cardiff: Can the minister tell us which areas are going to be developed?

Hon. Mr. Lang: There is going to be \$777,000 for industrial development that consists of one project, Mr. Chair. That is Dawson's Callison industrial subdivision and it is for lot development.

*Industrial in the amount of \$777,000 agreed to
On Residential*

Mr. Cardiff: I know the minister will stand up and tell which projects it is for. I would like to raise this issue and it is good to see there are other members listening to this conversation.

I know a number of years ago the government changed the way it disposes of land — that's probably not a good term to use — but the way it makes land available to Yukoners. Yukoners used to pay for the development costs of creating a subdivision. The market for land, because there appears to be more demand than there is supply, drove the price of land higher. By going to market value and looking at what other pieces of property are selling for and what you can get for them, it drove up the price of land that the government was making available, and the consumer is the one who is faced with higher costs in order to purchase a piece of land to build a home on.

There are Yukoners out there who have the ability and the resources to do that, but what I'm hearing, and what is challenging for us as a society — and it's challenging for us as a society because it's kind of the way we all grew up. You go to work, you put your hours in, you put your money away, and one day you hope to be able to buy a piece of property or buy a home. But what has happened is prices have risen. Building their own home is an option that a lot of people would like to have — building their own home.

You have to go out and buy the materials — at times, depending on what's going on in the world, the price of materials fluctuates — but your labour is your labour, and the ability to build your own home gives you an option that oftentimes is less expensive than actually going out and buying a home.

One of the major hurdles for people who've worked for a long time to try to get to that point, or for young people who are trying to get into the market, is the cost of property. By going to market value on land development, we've unknowingly placed that hurdle in front of our young people and people who would like the opportunity to purchase a piece of property and build their own home, because that's the only way they're going to get into home ownership.

I'm just wondering if the minister can tell us the reasons why this was done and whether or not they're looking at analyzing the implications of it and its effect on young people trying to get into the housing market and those who see the high price of these lots as an obstacle to homeownership.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I'll do the breakdown first and then I'll answer some of his questions.

The breakdown on residential was \$13,823,000. This consists of 11 projects — the Whitehorse peripheral residential at \$500,000 for planning; environmental assessment and design of lots in Grizzly Valley; \$150,000 for planning and design at Mount Lorne; \$970,000 for the completion of 141 new single and multi-family lots in Arkell.

There's \$8 million to begin construction of the Whiste Bend subdivision; \$2.328 million to continue construction of the 52 fully serviced urban residential lots in Haines Junction; \$1.175 million to continue construction of 29 country residential and two commercial lots at Willow Acres in the community of Haines Junction; \$100,000 for planning of country residential lots on the Dome Road in the City of Dawson; \$150,000 for option analysis, planning and environmental assessment in Carmacks; \$150,000 for examining options for the residential lots in Destruction Bay; \$150,000 for planning in Mayo; and \$150,000 for option analysis, planning and environmental assessment in the community of Watson Lake. That's the work we're doing with that line item.

As far as talking about land values and how the price is arrived at, the Department of Community Services develops the lots. Energy, Mines and Resources is responsible for selling the lots. It's handled through Energy, Mines and Resources, and of course Yukon Housing Corporation has an arm that does the financing.

In legislation, there is a development cost obligation and there are market costs, so there are different ways of looking at this. The member opposite can talk further on this when he talks to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources — they look at development costs and market costs and come up with a value.

I understand what the member is talking about in land values in and around the City of Whitehorse and in our other communities. Development costs are very high now.

So there is a cost to that. Again, we develop the lots through Community Services, and once we develop the lots, then Energy, Mines and Resources does the actual working with the customer base and selling the land itself.

Mr. Cardiff: I understand that this was a problem earlier on in this government's mandate and they have tried to move things around when it came to land planning and land development. The minister identified monies in the budget, not just for land development but also for planning. I guess what I would like to say to this minister and the other minister — since I am sure he's listening — is that when it comes to land development in the Yukon — that was fortuitous actually, I didn't see that coming, but when it comes to planning and developing land, both ministers need to pay attention to the wishes of the community and their desire to be involved in land planning issues before development takes place.

In some instances that is happening, but we've heard the Member for Lake Laberge speak about his concerns and his constituents' concerns about land planning processes and being involved in them — the community's desire to be involved. I know a land planning process is ongoing in Southern Lakes, in the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources' riding. But there are other communities as well that would like to see land planning or land plan reviews take place in their communities.

What I see here is lots of money being spent on land development. We can't discuss what's going on in Energy, Mines and Resources at this point in time, but the amount of money that's in the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources' budget

for actual land planning compared to what we're spending on land development is minuscule.

We need to take a different approach. The Minister of Community Services has a role to play in this in working with the other minister, to ensure that those concerns are being addressed before we rush ahead with all kinds of land development.

I'm sure in some communities these land developments are welcome, but what I'm urging the minister to do is take a broader look at the planning that needs to take place. If you look at prior years, we've seen large sums of money lapse in land development because projects didn't proceed. Some of that money could be better spent in the planning process for those communities.

It's not so much a question as a comment, and I await the minister's response.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Again, the member opposite is talking about land planning. We develop the land but the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources actually does all the planning and all the consultation. When the equipment hits the ground, that is when we come in. We also do engineering. We all have to remember that the cost is recoverable. So that is where your development cost comes in. It is the cost of producing the lots and it comes from the cost we have in the community to develop those lots.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, we're not done yet because the minister, in his remarks, talked about planning money for a number of communities, including the community of Mount Lorne. He is saying it is not him; it's the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who is responsible for land planning. If it is only development, there is \$150,000 in the budget for land development — he said it was planning but now he's saying it is not planning and they don't do planning; that's Energy, Mines and Resources. Then what land are they planning to develop?

Hon. Mr. Lang: All of this cost is a conceptual design and, of course, detailed designs that we work on. We're given the piece of land that has been chosen and Energy, Mines and Resources has designated as potential development. We do all the internal engineering to make sure the lots can fit into the area and then we go to work and develop the land. Then we deliver it back to Energy, Mines and Resources to sell it, so we're an agent for Energy, Mines and Resources. We do the work on the ground and, at the end of the day, the government comes up with the development cost, which is what it costs us to develop the land and that puts a value to it.

Energy, Mines and Resources sells it; Energy, Mines and Resources does the front work. We do the work in the middle and develop the lots that are designated by demand.

*Residential in the amount of \$13,823,000 agreed to
On Recreational*

*Recreational in the amount of \$150,000 agreed to
On Quarry Development*

*Quarry Development in the amount of \$250,000 agreed to
On Prior Years' Projects*

Prior Years' Projects in the amount of nil cleared

*Infrastructure Development in the amount of
\$71,233,000 agreed to*

On Revenues

Revenues cleared

On Transfer Payments

Transfer Payments cleared

*Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$77,005,000
agreed to*

Department of Community Services agreed to

Chair: Committee of the Whole will now proceed to Department of Economic Development. Do members wish a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: 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 Vote 7, Department of Economic Development, Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*. We will now continue with general debate.

Department of Economic Development

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: I am happy to table the Department of Economic Development's operation and maintenance and capital budgets for the 2010-11 fiscal year. The Department of Economic Development continues to support this government's key commitment to developing Yukon to the benefit of all Yukon people. Specifically, the department supports the government's priority of promoting a strong, diversified and sustainable private sector economy. In order to ensure Yukon's economy remains prosperous and diversified, the department continues to undertake work in the areas of wealth generation, economic benefits and our business environment. Mr. Chair, I think we've done a stellar job of this, considering that so far, in almost the last year, there has not been a single question in Question Period on economic development.

We enable a variety of wealth-generating, strategic, economic projects and activities across all economic sectors. We strive to increase the benefits derived from these projects and activities to Yukoners, First Nations and communities. We work to improve Yukon's business environment in order to attract increased investment, nationally and internationally, of course.

To support our work in these areas, the Department of Economic Development has taken on the specific roles and responsibilities. It is our role to develop a diverse, sustainable and competitive economy that will enrich the quality of life of all Yukoners. It's also our role to forge partnerships with First Nations in the economic development of the territory, and it is our role to pursue economic initiatives with the shared vision of prosperity, partnerships and innovation.

Within our strategic goals are the following key priorities and initiatives. It's the development of mining and other re-

source development projects where we will work with industry and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources on a coordinated approach to development and to continue and expand investment attraction and export development initiatives.

In the development of tourism-related projects, we will work with industry and the Department of Tourism and Culture on a coordinated approach to the development of external investment pathways and markets.

In the development and commercialization of research and innovation, we will work with Yukon College and other non-governmental partners on a coordinated approach to industry development. We will identify and examine opportunities to enhance innovation and commercialization of technology, and we will continue to facilitate the Yukon Cold Climate Innovation Centre.

In the development for filmmakers and sound recording artists, we will work with members of the film and sound industries to target export markets. We will provide professional development opportunities for filmmakers and sound recording artists, and we will support film and sound industry associations on issues of common interest.

To maximize the growth of Yukon's small and medium enterprises, we will support entrepreneurial development, identify and examine regional business opportunities; work with export-ready companies to target external investors and markets; we will facilitate, advise and promote support to businesses, First Nation development corporations and start-ups. We will support chambers of commerce and industry associations on issues of common interest.

To support First Nation economic development, we will work with First Nations and First Nation development corporations to enhance their organizational capacity for economic development, to facilitate access to capital and financing for First Nations in their economic development ventures, to help facilitate potential project structures to enable equity investment by First Nations, and support the development of regional, First Nation and community economic development plans.

To support the ongoing work of the Department of Economic Development, we are introducing a total capital budget of \$2.310 million and an operation and maintenance budget of \$13.854 million for 2010-11. Attracting external investment is critical to Yukon's economic growth and diversification. Investment enables Yukon business to expand operations, pursue new opportunities and explore potential. The department's investment-attraction strategy continues to guide the development of the diversified private sector economy, while focusing on key areas of opportunity.

The department has worked hard to develop Yukon's reputation internationally, and has continued to spread the message that Yukon has a wealth of opportunities across a variety of sectors. Yukon is both strategically located and has resources that fit the type of global demand generated by Asian markets.

Our mineral deposits of copper, lead, zinc, tungsten and iron ore are some of the largest in the world. Continuing our work and relationship building through travel to China, hosting inbound investors in Yukon and attending tradeshow has led

to significant investments by Chinese companies in Yukon-based projects.

This relationship building has taken place over time and we're now beginning to see the results. Four significant deals between Yukon-based companies and Chinese investors have been announced since October 2007. Yukon Zinc's Wolverine project was purchased by Jinduicheng Molybdenum Group or JMG and Northwest Non-Ferrous International Investment Co. for approximately \$101 million.

Yukon Zinc committed approximately \$155 million toward construction expenditures for 2009 and is expecting to commit an additional \$100 million for 2010. The construction of the mine employed an estimated 320 employees and it is expected to employ about 200 once in operation later this year. The mine is anticipated to be operational by mid- or late-summer 2010. This is the largest investment by Chinese investors in the Canadian mining sector to date.

We believe that the Yukon Zinc Wolverine mine will be the only new base metal mine opening in North America in 2010 and there are plans for an opening ceremony in the summer of 2010 when the first concentrate is produced from the mill. Yukon Zinc has been working with local stakeholders to help ensure that they benefit from Yukon's newest mine development.

The Yukon Nevada Gold Corporation and China-based Northwest Non-Ferrous International Investment Co. Ltd, completed a \$3-million agreement to form Yukon-Shaanxi Mining Company Inc. Further to this, Yukon-Shaanxi recently purchased the interest-bearing \$1.5-million secured debt of Tagish Lake Gold Corp. from Macquarie Bank Ltd.

Yukon-Shaanxi is a new Canadian company that will explore and develop mineral resources in Yukon. China Mining Resources Group Ltd. purchased over eight million shares in Selwyn Resources in September 2008, at a value of approximately \$1.9 million. In addition, Selwyn Resources announced its intentions to form a new \$100-million joint-venture operating company with the Yunnan Chihong Zinc & Germanium Co. Ltd. of Yunnan, a Chinese zinc and lead producer, to advance Yukon's Selwyn project to bankable feasibility. Completion of this transaction will result in a \$100-million investment by Yunnan in one of the largest undeveloped zinc and lead deposits in the world.

These are examples of how the investment attraction efforts of the department are leading to new investment capital, which is critical to the growth of wealth-generating industries.

Economic Development plays a key role in the investment attraction by introducing the potential investors to the opportunity and by facilitating the development of business relationships. Yukon is focused on ensuring that Yukoners and Yukon businesses share in the benefits generated by development in the mineral industry. By ensuring this, we're helping to strengthen the private sector economy, especially in rural Yukon.

Increasing Yukon's share of benefits generated from these industry developments, as well as supporting First Nation economic development, is an important step toward diversifying Yukon's economy. The department seeks to optimize industrial

benefits through supplier development initiatives to increase the number of local suppliers, procurement initiatives to increase their success in bidding for work, producing and working with stakeholders and partners on education and training initiatives to increase the number of local employees, and identifying and facilitating infrastructure and industrial synergies.

With the Yukon First Nations setting their economic priorities and playing the lead role in their economic futures, the Department of Economic Development works to support them from early planning stages through to implementation. Our activities include assistance in building capable institutions of governance and capacity development; assisting with the development of strategic direction, including strategic planning and economic development planning; assisting with the development of policies that support economic development; opportunity identification and project selection; assisting with the development of feasibility studies and business plans; and implementation of these plans and strategies.

Another important priority for the department is to support the development of strategic infrastructure required for economic development in Yukon. Demands on Yukon's infrastructure base are set to intensify because of the growth in the research and innovation sector; an increased interest in infrastructure developments from companies considering development in Yukon; and development of the new natural resource sector since this government came to power.

Improvements are necessary to all economic infrastructure areas, including energy, transportation, telecommunications and municipal infrastructure.

Infrastructure enables industry and lays the foundation for economic growth. Improving national and international transportation and trade links will lead to more business opportunities, more jobs for Yukoners and a higher quality of life.

Among the budget highlights, I would like to highlight some of the many activities the department identified in our 2010-11 budget. The department will continue to administer a variety of funding programs to support the diversification of Yukon's economy. Yukon government's continued investment in business, industry and capital projects is key to long-term, sustainable economic growth.

The Department of Economic Development supports the growth of Yukon business activity by allocating \$370,000 into the enterprise trade fund and its administration. With the focus on small- and medium-sized businesses, the ETF program stimulates and supports growth in market penetration and business development. Through this fund, eligible Yukon businesses involved in export-related operations may receive assistance to open new markets, develop and expand existing markets and undertake and implement projects that grow and develop business activities while not creating unfair competition within the local Yukon market.

The enterprise trade fund is available to all Yukon businesses, both profit and non-profit, intentionally or otherwise, as well as related organizations and industry associations. The program supports marketing and export projects that enhance the likelihood of Yukon businesses generating increased production and sales of Yukon produce and products.

Most importantly, all the funds projected, or the project funds, by the enterprise trade fund, require a meaningful investment by the company and organizations, essentially doubling the investment in promoting Yukon products, services and opportunities.

The department continues its ongoing partnerships with industry stakeholder groups to help Yukon businesses develop and maintain a competitive advantage in external markets. Stakeholders such as the Yukon Chamber of Commerce help us to raise the profile of Yukon businesses and the services and products they can offer to both inside and outside markets.

The department continues its support of the business community through the business incentive program, with a budget allotment of \$1.050 million. The program offers rebates to businesses that hire Yukoners and use Yukon-manufactured goods or eligible Yukon government contracts. We are also continuing to support the local loan program that provides modest but meaningful support to entrepreneurs with innovative business ideas.

There are no other programs in the Yukon that provide this type of support for small businesses, so we're thrilled to take this innovative approach that encourages and supports Yukon entrepreneurs who are launching new businesses.

The Yukon entrepreneurs support program is a new initiative that targets new or potential entrepreneurs interested in or are in the early stages of planning or operating their business. The program will be applicant-driven and will partner applicants with expert contractors and business-related NGOs with relevant small business experience. We anticipate this program will be up and running by the fall of this year.

The department makes regular contributions to various business-related organizations to support small- and medium-sized business export expansion and marketing initiatives. Yukon government continues to support research and innovation, adding to the economic diversity of Yukon and engaging growth in Yukon's manufacturing- and knowledge-based sectors.

The Yukon Cold Climate Innovation Centre continues to lead the way in applied cold climate research and technology in the circumpolar north. The geographic realities of Yukon and the changing climate of the north make new and innovative solutions necessary.

The centre's research and development fund has invested in local projects, creating commercial solutions to the challenges we face when living and working in a cold climate. Economic Development is contributing over \$480,000 in funding for operational support for the centre and for innovative climate and technology projects.

In addition, funding for the innovation centre is provided by a contribution agreement with Yukon College through the northern strategy program, consisting of \$125,000 over three years, also to support innovation projects. The centre is a partnership between applied researchers, industry and government and is dedicated to developing, commercializing and exporting sustainable cold climate technologies. It's also open to a variety of potential projects, specifically those focused on developing solutions for community infrastructure like roads and sewers in

the construction industry and those that address geotechnical challenges. It also has a permanent home located on campus here in Whitehorse at the Yukon College.

As well, the Yukon government continues to support the Technology Innovation Centre, which is now housed within the Yukon Cold Climate Innovation Centre to gain synergy between the two programs. The total department's contribution to these programs is \$719,000.

In addition to the innovation and technology sector, Yukon's other strategic industries include natural resources and tourism. Strategic projects are of the scale that will generate measurable increase in the output of the sector, and will act as a catalyst for development and generate secondary business opportunities. These projects support the government's goal of strengthening and diversifying Yukon's economy.

The Department of Economic Development strategic industries development fund will continue to provide significant support with \$907,000 allocated in this year's O&M budget. The strategic industries development fund provides assistance to research, develop and identify emerging opportunities and for the preparation of scoping studies, feasibility studies and business plans.

As I mentioned earlier, the department's efforts to attract investment in the Yukon mineral industry have really paid off. We've allocated \$666,000 in this budget, which will represent a variety of activities, including marketing, promoting, facilitating events and conferences, maintaining websites and consulting services in order to raise awareness of Yukon's investment opportunities.

In our efforts to assist Yukon communities and First Nations to fully benefit from the economic activity of their regions, we are allocating \$420,000 to the regional economic development fund and its administration.

This fund provides financial support to foster regional and community economic development. It was established in recognition of the need for effective coordination of planning and economic development efforts by all parties, with regional economics industries and interests. With that bit of an overview, I'll certainly entertain questions.

Mr. McRobb: I'd like to begin by thanking all the dedicated and hard-working employees in the Department of Economic Development on behalf of all Yukoners. We do recognize and appreciate the good work all the employees within the department are doing.

Now, having said that, I would like to just put on the record what I mentioned to the Government House Leader this morning. Forgive me, it is a bit procedural, but it has a direct connection to debating this department. I will stand down on my questioning at this opportunity in order to make available time for other priorities with respect to the business remaining on the Order Paper. I suggested that to the Government House Leader this morning. We haven't heard back from the Government House Leader.

I gave notice of a motion at the outset of today's proceedings, identifying the Department of Environment as a priority department we would like to have adequate debate on before the guillotine drops at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday. As we know, the

Yukon Party government has dictated — and probably always will dictate — the agenda for debate of matters that are brought forward in this Assembly. This government never asks us on the opposition side what we see as priorities and it never expresses a willingness to bring forward those items. In fact, when we do identify our priorities, they typically are avoided and sometimes never come up for debate at all.

It is really unfortunate that this guillotine clause truncates debate in this Assembly far too early to fully examine all departments in the budget, as well as pieces of legislation that are called during a sitting. We have raised this issue several times with the government, asking for the rules to be changed to do away with the 60 sitting-day maximum per annum rule, but the Yukon Party has refused. There are some very good arguments in favour of changing that rule, but I'll leave that discussion for another day.

I just did some quick arithmetic and there is about 11 hours of Committee debate left in this spring 2010 sitting. If the government side gives up its motion day on Wednesday, there would be 11 hours. But if it doesn't, and Wednesday is devoted to government private members' day, that leaves only eight hours of total debate time.

Given that the ministers normally spend about 20 minutes responding to a question — not answering a question, but responding to a question — the conclusion of this mathematical exercise resulted in about 16 to 20 questions being able to be asked before the final bell. There are several departments and pieces of legislation remaining.

It is within that context that, unfortunately, I must stand down on asking questions in this department. I know there are several aspects of it that are worthy of getting on the record, but earlier today I refreshed my memory of what happened a year ago and I saw that about two and a half days were spent debating this department. Quite often that debate was rather acrimonious and unproductive, and it included several rulings by the Chair of Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Chair, in the spirit of cooperation, I'm appealing to all members to remain productive and conscious of the time they consume, given the limited time left in this sitting, along with the outstanding business yet to be debated.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: In response to the member opposite, I have to also admit that, on a personal level, restricting the time and putting in a guillotine clause seems a bit strange, and it does remain a mystery why the very short-lived Liberal government brought it in.

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Point of order

Chair: Mr. McRobb, on a point of order.

Mr. McRobb: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, it was not a government that brought that in; it was an all-member agreement.

Chair's ruling

Chair: Order please. This is definitely not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, it was brought in obviously by the House, but certainly brought forward by the Liberal government, so it remains a good example of “be careful what you wish for” because you just might get it and have to live with it. It’s amazing what seems like a good idea at the time suddenly is incomprehensible a few years later.

In terms of time, I think everyone is well aware of the fact that while the government side may call what is up for debate, it is up to the opposition to time how they handle that information and by spending two, three, or four days on a single department, asking questions that often seem to have very little relationship to the budget at hand is not the best use of time. To then come back and say that it’s our problem is a bit humorous at best.

I’d like to get back to funding activities that we have had and that are involved and actually talk about the budget, especially the fact that I believe it has been over a year since any question came up in Question Period about economic development.

It was the former Liberal Party government, the shortest lived majority government in the history of the Commonwealth of Nations, which disbanded the Department of Economic Development. It has always seemed a bit strange that the best way to promote economic development is to disband the people who are responsible for it and scatter them around the government and, in some cases, eliminate them completely. It is just not something that is in my realm of understanding.

Anyway, some of the things that we try to support — economic development planning and capacity, development opportunity identification and associated research needs and assessments, training plans — are the sorts of things that we try to work on with the private sector, with NGOs, with for-profit — many, many different organizations have the ability to draw on these programs. The strength of these funding programs lies in the fact that they support a variety of stakeholders — First Nations, municipalities, NGOs, et cetera.

Another avenue by which the department supports a variety of stakeholders is through the community development fund, another program that seemed to die a death there for awhile until our Yukon Party government brought it back. It is widely known throughout the community.

The primary goal of CDF, or the community development fund, is to support projects that provide long-term well-being and bring social or economic benefits to Yukon communities. CDF projects continue to create employment, they generate local spending, they develop usable skills and enhance Yukon’s physical and social infrastructure.

This year, we’ve allocated \$3.3 million to the community development fund and its administration. CDF contributes substantially to the health of rural Yukon communities by giving community members an opportunity to network, share and participate in strengthening their neighbourhoods and their organizations. This fund fosters cooperation, partnerships and collaboration among groups, and emphasizes the importance of recreation and training for Yukon people.

The Selkirk First Nation community of Pelly Crossing is an excellent example, I think, whereby the spirit of collabora-

tion and cooperation can bring the community together to take advantage of economic opportunities, especially in the resource sector. Through the northern strategy funding, \$400,000 has been allocated in the capital budget to continue the Journey to Self-Reliance project. The department partnered with Selkirk First Nation to obtain funding for this project that will provide the First Nation with the organizational tools, processes and policies needed to strengthen their governance model.

With that, I’ll be available for further questions.

Mr. Cardiff: I have a few questions of a general nature related to the minister’s department. I’d like to thank the officials for being here today and all the work that goes into the Department of Economic Development and for providing the briefing books that lay out some of the background information and are helpful in developing some of these questions.

One of the background notes in the briefing book, regarding the corporate planning and economic policy, mentions there is \$1.758 million — there is \$628,000 for policy and planning.

The briefing book says that these personnel costs were partially offset by decreased costs associated with out-of-territory travel and contracting related to PNWER — which is the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region — and TILMA and other related senior official meetings. I’m just wondering if the minister could tell us what is happening around the *Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement* between Alberta and British Columbia. Is Yukon at the table on that? I was led to believe the government had decided that TILMA was not necessary and we were just going to go with the AIT. Could he answer that question, please?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: The member opposite is quite correct. TILMA was thoroughly investigated, thoroughly analyzed and the decision was made that, at this point in time, there is no benefit whatsoever to getting involved in that.

However, we remain involved with the *Agreement on Internal Trade*. The Committee on Internal Trade, which I was very pleased to be chair of up until December — that chairmanship has now been taken over by Saskatchewan.

There are a lot of things involved in the *Agreement on Internal Trade* that do reduce costs and red tape, and they give us access in a wider range across provincial and territorial borders. With all of the benefits there and as we develop the various chapters of that, we will continue to be involved in that. Our upcoming meeting is in about a month with the Committee on Internal Trade. TILMA at this point in time is effectively dead.

Mr. Cardiff: I’ll try to be a little more patient and thank the minister for the concise answer. I guess the reduction then related to TILMA is the fact that we’re not participating — it’s what I would assume.

I’d like to ask the minister a series of questions about the *Agreement on Internal Trade*. I’d like to know what the Yukon’s position is as it sits down to negotiate some of the next chapters that come up for discussion — what those chapters are and the specific positions that we’re taking on those chapters.

What type of analytical research has been done about the benefits or the downsides to Yukoners by participating in this? If the minister could provide a list — I don’t expect this here

today; it would be adequate if he can forward it by legislative return — of all the Yukon statutes and regulations that currently don't conform to the *Agreement on Internal Trade*, as well as a list of statutes, regulations, policies that have already been amended, deleted or added to ensure Yukon's compliance with the *Agreement on Internal Trade*.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Gradually what we refer to as chapters are sort of subagreements within this. Agriculture — I think we are pretty well done with at this point and that is going through the individual cabinets of the various jurisdictions.

Energy chapter — we're having some difficulties, as the member opposite can understand. It gets to be rather controversial, particularly when you get Newfoundland and Alberta and such. They have their own theories on that and some real difficulties in finding common ground, but common ground we do find.

While we do have a full-time staff member who is the point person for this, the resources of the whole department are brought in when we need consultation on this, so we have economists and tradespeople and lawyers who are looking at this on a daily basis. There are conference calls and sub-meetings going on all the time on top of the federal-provincial-territorial ministerial meetings. There is a lot of progress being made on this, but at the moment, the energy chapter is proving to be a bit problematic.

Mr. Cardiff: Well, I'm assuming the minister will provide those lists at a later time. When it comes to dealing with these kinds of sectoral agreements that are enshrined or become part of the *Agreement on Internal Trade*, the minister just told us that we're pretty close to finalizing a sectoral agreement on agriculture within the *Agreement on Internal Trade*.

What analytical research was done by this government in deal with that? What conversations did the department have with the agriculture community, the people who are producing agricultural products here in the Yukon — whether it is livestock, growing crops or producing products that come from the agricultural industry that are being created and exported?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, agriculture doesn't come under this department; it comes under Energy, Mines and Resources and the Agriculture branch, so these would be mostly the people we would go to for doing the consultations and such.

In the case of the Yukon, I have to admit that probably an awful lot of that chapter wouldn't apply because we're not trading, we're not exporting, and we're not raising beef to ship outside of the jurisdiction. Our agriculture is mostly for our own purposes and our own uses. Some of the agricultural trade things, of course, come up. The famous Blue Bonnet margarine dispute: one jurisdiction producing margarine that looked impressively like butter and the other jurisdiction that produced most of the butter getting upset about it — let's put it that way — and consequently there is dispute resolution mechanism that is enshrined in that.

I should mention, in anticipating questions, that the *Agreement on Internal Trade* does recognize government's ability to act for the public good and, to this end, legitimate objectives such as protection of the environment, health and

safety, well-being of workers — these are things that are recognized and exempted from this agreement. The agreement also does not apply to First Nation people, cultural industries or government's ability to raise money through taxation.

On a specific local note, we offer incentive programs like the business incentive program, or BIP, wherein we negotiated an exemption, so that has nothing to do with us either.

With agriculture, while there was some concern in the south about the level — and I'm sure this is where the question is going — and the degree of consultation with the agricultural industry, we did consult with the industry here on areas that would be affected. There are precious few where it would be affected, because our industry really just supplies us.

Mr. Cardiff: I understand what the minister is saying, but these are agreements that live on into the future and we need to ensure that we're not doing something today that may negatively affect our children or our grandchildren.

I know the minister knows my concerns with a number of issues I've raised before around the *Agreement on Internal Trade* — my concerns about the fact that we no longer have the ability to have a hiring preference. Yukon-hire is out the window. It was a good idea at the time, and I believe to some extent there's some valid rationale for ensuring that our local people get jobs first in government positions.

Where public money is being spent on large capital projects, I think that it's in the public interest that locals in communities where those projects are taking place have ample opportunity and first shot at a job. That's no longer the case and it's my understanding from talking to people who are working on some of these capital projects that we are faced with importing quite a few workers. There are people coming from all across Canada, yet I know that there are Yukoners who are still looking for work. I've got a concern about that. I also have raised concerns in the past about the harmonization of certification and it's not just as it relates to trades — whether you're a carpenter, a sheet metal worker, a plumber, an electrician.

Some of these professions are self-regulating to some extent. They set the bar, the standard of work and the scope of what their profession practices. I'm speaking specifically at this point about the nursing profession — the registered nurses and how these agreements affect that. We know that just about every department in the government has some individual looking at the statutes, the regulations and the policies of their departments to ensure compliance with the *Agreement on Internal Trade*, and the minister is going to send over those lists at some point in the future. But today what I'd the minister to provide is assurances to the public — to Yukoners — that they're going to be informed appropriately about what changes are going to be forced on the Yukon due to compliance with the *Agreement on Internal Trade*.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Yes, I forgot earlier that list that the member wanted — we'd be happy to send it over — no problem with that.

While the Department of Economic Development has the lead on the *Agreement on Internal Trade*, there are actually a number of other departments that control a lot of what this question involves. For instance, labour mobility is under the

purview of the Department of Education. I plead with the member opposite not to ask me why, because I have no idea why. That's just the way it has come down. Things involving the agricultural chapter go into Energy, Mines and Resources. Finance has been the lead, really, on financial instruments, financial penalties and securities and these sorts of things.

A lot of what the member is asking I'm sort of speculating on — not speculating on, but talking about it, even though it involves other departments. I won't sort of put it off and say, you know, "Go to them."

Some of the things we addressed with the internal trade agreement — I mean, some of the silly things, like a truck crossing a border; it might go across five jurisdictions and require five different permits and five different stamps and five different stickers and be subject to five different sets of rules. It makes little sense.

In my own profession, I could maintain a very active and, I thought, good veterinary practice, but I couldn't go across kilometre 37 on the Atlin Road and give a vaccine because I wasn't licensed in British Columbia. A lot of the effect is in those areas. The general rule of thumb is, if you're certified in one jurisdiction, you're certified in all.

There are abilities for each jurisdiction to add — in other words, not have only that certification, but that certification plus other things. So there are ways to keep that standard very high and I can give the reassurance that is the case. It just makes very little sense to go to the duplication on so many of these things.

The goods and services chapter is another one I had forgotten to mention earlier that is being worked on and, for instance, how Public Works is working on the procurement and harmonization of transport regulations and standards — that is another one. So there are all sorts of different groups working on this but again the point people and the point person and the point department is ours. In general, I think we'll be doing away with a lot of red tape and a lot of duplication on this, but I can certainly give the member opposite assurances that there are mechanisms that can maintain the high standards if anyone in the jurisdiction wants to put additional qualifications on it.

Mr. Cardiff: I guess the concern is that we don't want it to be a race to the bottom of standards and services. I recognize the — as I said earlier, I have raised our concerns about the *Agreement on Internal Trade* and the free trade agenda. I raised some of that during the second reading of the *Labour Mobility Amendments Act*. We have raised our concerns about trade deals that have the potential to actually trump the democratic rights of citizens. We believe that it an ecological imperative that we rethink economic globalization, the economic system that currently appears to be, quite frankly, pretty weak. When you look at what has happened here in North America, when you look at what's happening within the EU right now, it's pretty fragile. There has been some suggestions that in the future if we as a community, if mankind is going to survive, it's going to require us to kind of reinvent those local economies again and the agenda for greater trade liberalization for more free trade, free of those capital encumbrances, which often in-

terferes with the ability of local communities to organize as they see fit.

For instance, Highways and Public Works is working on the procurement and harmonization of transport. The minister touched on some of that. It's about those dispute resolution processes that often penalize small jurisdictions and small communities. What I'd like to know — I'm going to give the minister a little bit of a chance to think about this philosophically about just what potential these trade agreements have, both positively and negatively, for the Yukon. I'd like to know whether his government's support for these agreements — the trade liberalization — is based on ideology or whether or not the government has actually done some detailed research and analysis of entering into these agreements.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: Again, I think probably — well, I don't mean this in a bad way, you know, just a lack of experience in terms of working with governments. This isn't an area where one or two or five people sit down and make that decision. That's why we have a Department of Economic Development. It's why we have economists and accountants and finance people and 40 or 50 people to basically identify and tear these decisions down and decide whether or not they're beneficial. That was the whole debate with TILMA. The opposition at the time — and I don't remember that being the member opposite — but certainly the Official Opposition wanted a decision right now on TILMA. I'd rather deal with fact.

I'd rather have my department tear that agreement apart and make determinations of whether or not it is of value to Yukon. In that case, over a reasonable amount of time and careful consideration and evaluation, it was determined that, no, it simply was not beneficial to us. Then we can make the decision with facts; that makes much more sense.

I am convinced — and I think those of us on this side are convinced — that the trade liberalization really opens up Yukon borders. It opens up to much more going out than we would interfere with coming in. You can always find a problem in anything, but, in this case, I think it's highly beneficial.

The way the trade dispute goes is that each jurisdiction appoints one — anyway, I think we appointed one, but I think you can appoint up to two — to sit on this dispute resolution empanelment, so that when the dispute comes up, a neutral panel can be chosen from people whom the jurisdictions have shown faith in. In our case, we have a very talented lawyer who has agreed to sit on this.

The other concern at the time was the level of penalty. What might be an onerous penalty to the Yukon might be a minor irritation to Ontario.

We negotiated the lowest of trade penalties, should a dispute come about. Now I'm hard pressed to think of how we would get involved in a dispute like the famous Blue Bonnet margarine event, but in general, there is a mechanism there.

The interesting hook on that is that if you fail and lose, and fail to pay that financial penalty, which in our case is \$250,000, you forfeit the right to make any further dispute, accusations or claims until that one is settled. This had to be added, because there were some difficulties down south with some of the jurisdictions basically saying, "You know, we're not going to get

too excited about this.” But I think in general a good, careful analysis by an awful lot of very talented people has shown that the benefits to the Yukon far outweigh the few — and there are a few disadvantages.

Mr. Cardiff: I think it’s important that we recognize the disadvantages. I don’t think that it’s fair to infringe on the democratic rights of our citizens when it comes to their ability to go to work, raise a family and, as I was talking about earlier today, build a home for their families.

In a lot of instances, this has the potential to affect the employment and the decisions of businesses, and if it does that, it affects the ability of people to work.

We were looking on the PNWER website awhile back and came across some comments or information on the website called “Pacific NorthWest Economic Region.” It is a public-private partnership chartered by the states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington and the western Canadian provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Yukon and Northwest Territories.

We might want to clarify that because that is the way it appears on the website. I had a recent experience myself with being misrepresented on a website. It goes on to say that “PNWER is dedicated to encouraging global economic competitiveness and preserving our world-class natural environment.”

I’m glad that while we’re looking at global economic competitiveness in our local economy, we are still looking — and I would encourage them to spend a lot of time looking — at how we can preserve our world-class natural environment because, quite frankly, in the Yukon, I think that’s some of the best things we have, not necessarily to sell, but to generate an economy.

It goes on to say that PNWER is recognized by both the United States and Canada as a model for regional and binational cooperation. Because of its proven success, PNWER is a respected resource for our region and provides the public and private sectors a cross-border forum for unfiltered dialogue that capitalizes on the synergy between business leaders and elected officials who work to advance the region’s global competitiveness.

The minister knows my concerns about public-private partnerships already and that a lot of times, the private sector — I’m not saying all the time either, because I’ve heard some recent examples, and there are lots of examples of businesses that are socially minded and contribute in various ways to socially progressive employment workplaces. They contribute to socially progressive non-government organizations in their community that are doing good work.

This is not a hit at business at all, but I still have concerns that the bottom line for business is what ends up being most important in a lot of instances.

I’m just wondering if he can share with Yukoners some of that unfiltered dialogue that capitalizes on the synergies between business leaders and elected officials and tell us what it is that is being discussed at these meetings. Specifically, I’d like to know if discussions take place and what discussions take

place about some of the more social-related issues that are challenging to our territory.

While we’re addressing the economy and the environment when we’re having these discussions, what are we doing to address things like homelessness, drug addictions, alcohol and drug treatment, social services? When we start developing trade agreements and these relationships, oftentimes some of these things are viewed as stumbling blocks to forming an agreement and they get shuffled off to the side. We don’t want to see that. I just want the minister to let us know what is being discussed specifically in those areas.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: I really thank the member opposite for giving me an opportunity to get into this. PNWER is a rather amazing organization. If it were to become its own country, it would have the eighth largest economy in the world. It was formed as a partnership between the public sector and private sector. It’s a very active organization; it’s not simply a place to go and sit down and talk, per se. We have 15 active working groups — I think it’s around 15, anyway. It might be 16 now. Each group is chaired by a private sector and public sector chair, so there are two co-chairs.

Usually, one will be an elected official; it could be a state senator or state representative or the equivalent in Canada, and then someone within that area. For instance, in telecommunications, the public sector chair is, I believe a state representative — no, it has changed now. I believe it is an MLA from Saskatchewan. The private sector chair is the technical vice-president for Northwestel.

Each group will bring together its own working group to identify what the problems are in that area. In the case of the technology and telecommunications, is it compatibility of cell-phone systems? Is it a compatibility of land line systems, et cetera? They will bring various groups together to discuss this at, more often than not, monthly conference calls.

At the time of the actual meetings, each group will have identified something they want to bring out to the general population, and those will be the topics that will come up, and there will be presentations by the working group — having gone through all these machinations — so that somebody from central Montana, in a decision-making capacity — for instance, a state senator — who can actually sit down and listen to a nice presentation on GSM versus CDMA and how that is resolving and where the technology is going, et cetera.

It gives the private sector an insight into where the public sector is going and it gives the public sector an insight of what the technical specifications and technical limitations are.

I would like to give two good examples of that. A number of years ago, within PNWER, we started what we referred to as “disaster resilience.” In other words, if there were a disaster, how would we react to that disaster?

Finally, in getting the groups to sit down at the first conference and do the planning for this — it was referred to as the “Blue Cascade” I think. It was a takeoff on a thing that was done in the United States called the “Purple Cascade.” Purple cascade looked at the implications of a category 4 hurricane hitting New Orleans. At the time, it was felt that wouldn’t create as much of a disaster — little did they know — as they

wanted to simulate so they also put a terrorist cell, using that as a means of creating an act of terror. It looked at how the public and the private sectors would react to that sort of thing in the area. Ironically, if you read the document, it pretty well tells you exactly what happened with Katrina.

They did the exercise, nobody took it that seriously, and there would probably have been thousands of lives saved and huge property savings.

When we first looked at the Blue Cascades in the meetings that occurred in Seattle, private sector doesn't really like giving out their secrets and that's business; that's normal. Sometimes the public sector really is not an awful lot better. But when you had both sitting down in the room, it was determined that should there be an earthquake, for instance, in the Seattle area, it turned out that there's a building in Seattle at that point that controlled virtually all of the Internet for the Pacific Rim, including Asia. Nobody ever realized that until they all sat in the same room and thought, "Oh my God, what do we do if this hits?" And they began this disaster resilience planning for what might happen. It's another good example of putting public and private sectors together to start talking about those problems.

Before I get to the other good example that I wanted to use, another example would be the energy working group through their discussions and such commissioned — and we go after grants. We're a grant-driven organization. We go after the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources; we go after basically anybody we can, including public sector. They kick in money for these studies sometimes. We have created actually — and I don't believe this is on the website yet — a PNWER North office because the one year that we created this, \$350,000 came out of the U.S. government for various projects and \$10,000 out of the Canadian government, which actually came out of the consulate in Seattle.

I asked the question in a meeting with Stockwell Day at the time if this was because the office is in Seattle and you really don't want to be sending large cheques to a foreign country. His response was yes — that was part of the problem. So we created PNWER North, which now lives in Edmonton, and I am one of the three directors of that. It was all done pro bono. A very major law firm, which can see the benefits of doing this and increasing our capabilities, did all the work pro bono. It cost us nothing to set this up so it is another good example of working together. So that has worked out well for us and we're starting to see some stuff come out of that.

Out of the agriculture working group, through the discussions of mad cow and avian flu and all of these things, there are so many difficulties. Of course, in the north, we saw so many of these first-hand. For instance, there might be a ban on cattle but somehow most of the U.S. border people never quite realized that moose and caribou aren't cattle.

I know one guy who had a ham sandwich pulled right out of his mouth as soon as he had a border crossing. Educating the Customs and livestock people and trying to get the groups together in terms of working on this together — for instance, the number of calves that are born in Canada and go across into the States to grow and then would be brought back to Canada, or the other way around. Once the U.S. started blocking the cattle

industry, the livestock industry started working with us through this working group and saying, "This is killing us." In fact, four or five major abattoirs in the States closed down and, I think, a similar number opened in Canada, so we came out of that in very, very good shape. But trying to explain that to the U.S. Department of Agriculture — so it wasn't just the Americans going in and saying, "This is killing us," or the Canadians going in and saying "Please open." It was both. That's often the benefit too. When we're in the United States, we're considered "that Canadian group", and when we're in Canada, we're considered "that American group". The reality is that we're neither. It becomes much easier — for instance, the enhanced drivers' licences — to go in and say, "This is going to be a problem. This is going to be hugely embarrassing to the Vancouver Olympics if hundreds of thousands of people appear at the border to come to the Olympics and they can't get through the border, because they don't have a passport, or the passport is not current or it's not in the right format, and then trying to convince them.

Not only is this irritating to the Americans, but it's irritating to a different segment of Americans. What do you do if you're from Skagway and you have to come up for dental work for the kids, and you have three kids? You're going to need a lot of money worth of passports. Again, it's not the Canadians arguing this; it's the Americans themselves arguing this. This is suddenly the Alaska state senators who are involved in this — Senator McGuire, Senator Dyson and others — to bring that message in.

The other part of this is that we have a policy of, every year, visiting the state and provincial or territorial capital of each jurisdiction, as well as visits to Ottawa and Washington. Again, it gives credibility when you go in and start talking about these problems, and go in with a larger group to say this is huge. For instance, another minor one we're working on now with our federal senator in Ottawa, with great help from PNWER and from the Americans: if an American comes up to Skagway and rents a car, they can drive it into Canada with no trouble, and go on a tour, but if somebody comes up from, say, British Columbia and gets off that boat and wants to rent a car, they can't leave Skagway. They can't cross the Canadian border if they're a Canadian citizen.

It is a stupid, stupid regulation. In Ottawa or Washington, it's a minor irritation. For our tourism industry, it's a huge irritation. It has just got so many problems it isn't funny. So not only is it — again, if our senator is going to try to fight this with National Revenue, but suddenly they're fighting with all of the Alaskans, et cetera. Because of these visits to all of the capitals, when we go in we go in not only with state senators, we'll go in with federal senators — Lisa Murkowski. We'll go in with Governor Parnell.

When we dealt with the enhanced drivers' licences and the secure drivers' licences and such, we went in there with Premier Campbell of British Columbia. We went in there with Governor Gregoire — Christine Gregoire of the State of Washington. So PNWER is working both public and private partnerships. It's a place where both can sit down and both have that

discussion and both accomplish much more than either group could do initially.

Anyway, I don't know if that's the information you were looking for.

Mr. Cardiff: I thank the minister for that answer and the explanation of what's currently going on there.

The minister has made quite a few trips to China promoting doing business in the Yukon. The department, we understand, has a website that is now in Mandarin. There are a couple of questions here. We would like to know whether there are any future trips planned. I would like to know what the criteria is for Yukon business people and Yukon First Nation governments — or “development corporations” would probably be more appropriate although I am not going to speculate or judge which would be more appropriate. What are the criteria in order to be invited to participate? Government has recently come under some criticism from at least one First Nation, and it is about the kind of open for business policy and the actual realities of how we're promoting ourselves, both nationally and internationally

I don't know that telling potential investors that everything's just hunky-dory and that you don't have to worry about it because land claims have been settled — because that's not the reality in the real Yukon today. There are still First Nations without agreements who still have the ability to assert their right over what happens on and in their traditional territory. Until these things have been resolved, I don't think government should necessarily be doing that.

At the same time, the minister mentioned this in his opening remarks about working with First Nation governments to promote economic activity for the benefit of the community and for the benefit of First Nation people, as well, in all communities. We need to think about that and how the government can facilitate those discussions between companies that are coming into the Yukon wanting to do business, specifically wanting to mine or get into resource extraction industries that have an impact on the land, the water and the wildlife.

We need to ensure we're not leaving these communities out of the equation. They need to be active participants in the discussion and in the creation of the business plans these companies are going to create to do business in those communities.

Communities have a right to assert their beliefs about what should happen in their community. It's about local planning. This is where, when we get into some of these other agreements, communities get left behind and they get told what's going to happen in their communities, instead of being part of it.

The recent press release by the Liard First Nation kind of highlights how some communities feel. Maybe not all communities feel that way, but certainly it would seem that they do. We need to do better. The minister has a role in this. The Premier certainly has a role in this as a representative of that region. He should be stepping up to the plate and ensuring that his constituents' voices are heard when it comes to these things. I would encourage the Minister of Economic Development to have a discussion with them about that so they can be included.

We're going to these other jurisdictions, China included. I would like to know whether there are any other trade-type missions planned to China or other jurisdictions. Could the minister respond to my comments about including community representatives on these trade missions and what the criteria is, how you get involved and invited to go? In relation to the Economic Development website that is in Mandarin — because I don't speak Mandarin and I don't read Mandarin, I would be interested to see the translation — and obviously not today, but at some point in the future by legislative return — of how the Yukon is being marketed in Mandarin to the markets in China.

The translation — and obviously not today, but at some point in the future, by legislative return — a translation of how the Yukon is being marketed in Mandarin to the markets in China.

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: I'm very, very glad the member opposite brought this up because it highlights the misconceptions and wrong ideas on this. First of all, to get it right out of way, in the terms of the translation of the Mandarin website, it is a translation of the English version. If he goes on the website and looks at the English version, that is what it is. There is no difference. It's a different language, but it's a duplicate.

The Chinese way of doing business is quite substantially different from ours in many respects. They deal with relationships, they deal with people they know and trust and such. For instance, I was invited because of my position a few years back as president of PNWER, to go over with the Energy Council on a trip to China. It was a marvelous four or five days in Beijing. The next year at Energy Council, the biggest thing that everyone had to say was that it was a waste of time because we didn't get any deals out of it.

You don't go in and run around and sign some deals and everything else. You go in, you have dinner, which is a very huge part of the Chinese business culture, and you go back and you invite them, and over a couple of years you get to a point where you can start really determining some business.

It's also very important to know, within the Chinese government, that the government here is supportive because there are just so many scams — for want of a better term — in other parts of the world that they get caught up in. One of the very first questions that I got from the director general of the Ministry of Commerce in Beijing was, “Will you treat our companies the same way you treat Canadian companies?” We said, “Yes, absolutely.” They will be held to the same environmental laws, the same standards, the same workers, same wages — everything. They all sat back and you could almost hear the sigh, and said, “Excellent, because if you aren't willing to do that we aren't willing to deal with you.” It blew me away. It was not the response that I was expecting at all, but it was what we got, not only from MOFCOM — the Ministry of Commerce — but also NDRC, the National Development Reform Commission.

It took us four years, I think it was. The National Development Reform Commission is a branch of the Chinese central government that has to approve any large investments going out, so it's a regulatory body in every sense of the word.

I was rather horrified at a meeting two years ago, I guess it was. We were summoned to a meeting when we were in Bei-

jing with the director general of NDRC. After a little humour with the translators and this sort of thing, it ended up that they were using our translator and we were using a translator that we had hired on contract. After a few jokes about my cane and everything else, he wanted to know when the good time was to come to the Yukon. After trying to get him on a dog sled — that didn't work too well — they agreed they would come back; they would come over and, in his words, "We'll bring lots of investors."

That's not something you expect to hear from a regulatory body. But that's four years of work and four years of going back and trying to explain what we have to offer, what we're going to require of them, what they're going to have to do, how well they're going to have to work with First Nations — that's all a part of it. That's right up front from the very beginning.

The groups that go over with us are investment-ready projects. In other words, if there is a mine that's getting close and they're looking for investment, that's the sort of group that is worthwhile putting together. To bring somebody over who simply wants to sort of spray in the air and hope they hit something, that's of no value.

That's not what we're trying to do. That's not what the Chinese are expecting. They would be insulted to have that sort of thing. When they come over here, they're usually coming over here to look at very targeted things. They're looking at a specific property or a specific group of properties. They're not coming over to look in this general area. I remember a political cartoon — I'm probably dating myself on this one — but the political cartoon had a map of the entire country of China missing from it and Richard Nixon pointing to the map saying, "Now is this generally the area that we're talking about?"

You know, they're coming over for very specific, investment-ready projects. Korea Zinc is one that we have dealt with a bit and they have put a little bit of money into it. We're hoping to deal with Korea Zinc more. KORES — Korea Resources is an agency of the Korean government that is involved in investment.

In Korea, when you think of Hyundai and Samsung, you start realizing all of the stuff that comes out of Korea. But less than three percent of the raw materials that go into that are from Korea; 97 percent of the raw materials they have to bring in. So they're actually quite hungry for a lot of these resources.

But it has been a much slower slog with Korea than China. We have been very fortunate to have some very good relationships over there. As I mentioned before, we're just starting to get benefit for what we put into it, but to think that you're going to go over and have a couple of meetings and sign a deal is just simply not going to happen. The Yukon mining portal has information on it and we give the information in turn. We brought over sheets, for instance, with maps on where the First Nation traditional territories are and put them in touch with the people — if you are going to negotiate and look at this property, these are the First Nations you have to be talking to. My recommendation, always, is don't go in and think you're going to push your way in. Go in and look at a partnership and look at a way to work together.

There is an old Chinese proverb that basically says if everybody doesn't win, then nobody wins. So far everything I've seen of dealing with these groups — and I am sure there are others that aren't — but of the groups that we've dealt with, they seem to live quite nicely by the credo that unless they can work together to bring the capacity together and to work together, then it is simply not going to work.

Statistically, if the member opposite is looking for some statistics, there were 11 outbound investment missions into Asia since 2004; 22 inbound investment missions by Asian investors since 2004. We have six significant deals between Yukon-based companies and Asian investors, announced only since 2007, so we've got a number of years there where we didn't produce much of anything — but we didn't expect to. It's always kind of funny — you go over and you spend a week there and the first thing the media wants to know is "what deal did you sign?" We didn't go there to sign a deal. We went there to set up this relationship and then all of a sudden the deals are flowing from that point. I hope that gives the member opposite some information.

Mr. Cardiff: Just a couple more questions for the minister. I'm going to move on to a different area of the minister's responsibility, and that is the film and sound incentive programs. There was an issue that affected my community recently. That was — and I just want to make sure there are some safeguards in place to ensure — around a specific production. I believe it was *Red Coat Justice*.

There were problems for people who were doing work related to this film being paid before the company had actually received — I'm just wondering what kinds of safeguards there are to ensure that people and businesses get paid before they receive the benefits.

As well, I'm not sure what kind of regulation is required around this industry. I know we talked about and actually brought forward some ideas about legislation for young people working in the industry — around hours of work and what would be appropriate. I'm thinking more along the lines about when they're building sets and I was kind of disturbed to hear it. I can understand that if you're building something that's temporary and it's being used as a set, it wouldn't necessarily be built to the same standards as a regular building, but we need to ensure the safety of those people who are working on it. I'm wondering if there are any regulations governing that in the Yukon.

The other thing is the liability involved with disposing of it or ensuring that it's not just left there; that when these companies come to the Yukon and do these productions, when they leave, they basically take their mess with them and we don't see what happened out on the Wheaton River happen again. Can the minister give us an answer to that question — or those questions?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: One thing to just insert before that, — I guess we get off the topic so quickly — the Yukon Gold Mining Alliance is a newly formed alliance, completely industry-driven, for investment attraction and they're looking to Canada, the United States and Europe for investment. Given what's happening in Europe now there may be some limita-

tions, but again this is another not necessarily Asian incentive, but it's driven that way.

For the member opposite, in terms of *Red Coat Justice*, the Film and Sound Commission will try to offer incentive programs to draw these groups up here.

But once drawn, they are subject to everything — the Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board, all the safety regulations, construction, et cetera. There is no difference there than any other company.

It was filmed during the summer of 2009. It was a co-production. It hired 70 Yukoners in cast and crew roles. We figured they spent around \$900,000 in the Yukon. They can be provided with up to \$250,000 within our programs, which are available to any company that applies and is accepted for it — \$250,000 in financial support.

As is our standard practice, the company is required to pay all outstanding Yukon invoices before we release the entire rebate amount and that has not happened, and the member opposite is well aware of the fact. Specifically, they arrived in the Yukon on July 22, began filming on August 4, completed on August 27, and they closed the production office on September 4.

They did contract businesses and individuals for a variety of services. But again, that's a private company dealing privately with individuals. We did not facilitate negotiations of contracts between the production company and Yukoners for any service or contract. The government and the Yukon Film and Sound Commission had nothing to do with that. But we are aware of the fact that there are still outstanding invoices.

Of the money that is out, there is approximately \$70,000 withheld at this point that will not be paid to them until they have met their obligations. We feel that that likely is more than what is actually outstanding so it behooves them to finish off and do a proper job. I think they will. We're only one of a number of funders. Telefilm Canada is another one that has put money into it.

It is an interesting business. It is not that you get the money up front and then you simply buy it. It is a question of them having to do the production and they have to market that product once they are done. This has taken a bit longer than the accepted norm that we would think about. Anyway, there is plenty of money there to cover what is outstanding, should they renege on it. We have made very certain of that.

In terms of the so-called church or the building that the member opposite refers to, *Red Coat Justice* is about a Mountie in a little town that is basically wall tents. The church is sort of the centre point of a big "U", with the two lines of wall tents going down there. Early on, it is a structure that is simply being built and it is built because of the fact that there was a variety of scenes, including one explosion scene, which was done completely through Workers' Compensation Health and Safety Board and everything else.

It was built out of four-by-fours and, in some cases, six-by-sixes. It's quite a substantial building.

Toward the end of the filming period, the film requires the Mountie to return to this village and the church is now complete, and it's clad and it's roofed. The company had permis-

sion to build this and, as the member opposite alludes, there was a requirement to remove it. They were quite willing to remove it, but they approached us and said if there was anyone who could benefit from this, they would be willing to donate the building materials, because they were going to pull it apart and sell off the building materials.

We contacted the Klondike Snowmobile Association, who thought this would be a fantastic place. The media has reported it as a warming shack or something; that was never the intention. It would never hold up to anything like that but, as a place for a family outing and a family snowmobile run, or something like that, it would be a great family opportunity. We sort of put the two groups together.

In order to facilitate that, the Film and Sound Commission purchased it for a dollar, to keep it legal. For a wide variety of reasons, the snowmobile association lost interest in the project. Others weren't interested in doing anything with it and so we ended up removing the facility ourselves. I have to point out that the article that appeared in the media was written by a reporter who was in fact not only on the cast or crew of that production, but is also one of the ones who has outstanding money owed to him. I might suggest that the media might engage a reporter who doesn't have such a vested interest in the way it is reported. It would be to everyone's advantage. Anyway, that's the story behind it. It was a good idea that would benefit the snowmobile association but, in the end, not so much.

Mr. Cardiff: My understanding is it was built in an area that is likely to flood. Is it the minister's intention to have the building removed?

Some Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Cardiff: It's gone? Totally removed? Okay, thank you.

The only other question I have for the minister is, could the minister explain — when it comes to things like the enterprise trade fund, the strategic industries development fund, or the regional economic development fund — but specifically, I think the strategic industries fund is what I'm looking for: how does the department determine the priorities when transferring that money?

Hon. Mr. Kenyon: We have a staff in Regional Economic Development and a staff in Strategic Industries. They will look at these proposals, look at the business plan. They could involve the enterprise trade fund to try to develop that business plan. It's not just something where the money is given out, but we do take a look in great detail and work with the proponents. I mean, what comes in might not be acceptable, but with a little bit of work on it, it might be a very reasonable proposal. We work with them on that at the same time. But we have a good number of staff in the department — that's what they do. They evaluate these projects and look at the probability of the funding, ending up in a good, solid project.

Chair: Is there any further general debate? Seeing none, we'll proceed line by line on Vote 7, Department of Economic Development.

Mr. Cardiff: I don't have the lines in front of me, but what I'd like to do is request the unanimous consent of Com-

mittee of the Whole to deem all lines of Vote 7, Department of Economic Development, cleared or carried, as required.

Unanimous consent re deeming all lines in Vote 7, Department of Economic Development, cleared or carried

Chair: Mr. Cardiff has requested the unanimous consent of Committee of the Whole to deem all lines in Vote 7, Department of Economic Development, cleared or carried, as required. Is there unanimous consent?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

Chair: Unanimous consent has been granted.

On Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenditures in the amount of \$13,854,000 agreed to

On Capital Expenditures

Total Capital Expenditures in the amount of \$2,310,000 agreed to

Department of Economic Development agreed to

Chair: Committee of the Whole will proceed to the Women's Directorate. Do members wish a brief recess?

All Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Recess

Chair: Order please. Committee of the Whole will now come to order. The matter before the Committee is Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*.

We will now proceed with general debate in Vote 11, Women's Directorate.

Women's Directorate

Hon. Ms. Horne: It is indeed my pleasure to present the Women's Directorate budget for the 2010-11 fiscal year. Before presenting the details in the budget, I am pleased to advise that the work in the past fiscal year included continuation of the work on the Whitehorse affordable family housing project, which is approaching completion and will be ready for tenants this fall. I am pleased to advise that it is on time and underbudget.

There was a very well-received women's forum hosted by the Yukon Advisory Council on Women's Issues in October 2009. The theme was "Smart cookies and their dough" and over 100 Yukon women participated in this two and a half day event. Two training events were offered to government and non-government front-line workers on responses to women involved in substance abuse.

This grew from the 2008 report, improving treatment and support for Yukon girls and women with substance use problems and addictions. Additional clinical training was offered in four communities — Whitehorse, Dawson City, Haines Junction and Watson Lake — to direct service providers working with women and substance abuse. The prevention of violence against aboriginal women fund was increased from \$100,000 to \$200,000. The fund is for proposal-driven projects that specifi-

cally address the cessation of violence perpetuated toward aboriginal women, who face much higher rates of violence than other women.

The Women's Directorate completed an evaluation and made recommendations regarding the women's equality fund and the women's community fund. The recommendations were that the funds be increased and continued. These are highlights of the accomplishments of the Women's Directorate over the 2009-10 year. I would now like to share the budget highlights for 2010-11.

The Women's Directorate's budget is \$1,747,000 for 2010-11 and consists mainly of personnel and transfer payments. This is an increase of \$508,000 from the 2009-10 forecast. It is a project-driven budget, which is reflected in the impact of larger policy or public education initiatives that are begun, ongoing or completed in any given year.

The budget for 2010-11 includes an increase of \$125,000 to the women's equality fund, which brings this fund to \$300,000 per year. Women's organizations can apply for up to \$50,000 per year for three-year terms and this gives the organizations the choice of either operational or project funding.

An increase in personnel of \$136,000 includes funding for a new social marketing analyst position, which is part of the *Victims of Crime Strategy* — this position is a three-year term position — an increase to the administrative assistant position from a 0.6 full-time employee to a full-time employee and funding to cover the higher salary for backfill for the director. An increase of \$215,000 is for the aboriginal women's program, northern strategy funding. This funding is for the implementation of the Yukon Aboriginal Women's Summit's recommendations.

The three major initiatives for this fiscal year are as follows: Liard Aboriginal Women's Society, or LAWS, youth violence prevention project, \$68,940; Whitehorse Aboriginal Women's Circle, aboriginal women's mentorship training project, \$82,800; Yukon Aboriginal Women's Council, Yukon sisters in spirit project, \$63,680. An increase of \$100,000 is for program materials for the *Victims of Crime Strategy* implementation. This funding will allow the social marketing analyst to carry out a campaign to reduce violence against women. Funds will be used for local contractors to produce multi-media materials that will support the campaign.

There is an increase of \$5,000 to the women's community projects funding, which brings this funding to \$10,000 per year. This fund can be accessed by eligible organizations that are looking for a top-up for training, organizational development or program expenses.

There is a decrease of \$41,000, which reflects the completion of the women and substance abuse workshops.

With that, I will conclude my remarks so that the members may respond. Günilschish.

Mr. Elias: It's always an honour and privilege to stand on the floor of the Legislature and debate the 2010-11 budget. As always, I would like to thank and congratulate all the dedicated and hard-working employees within the Women's Directorate.

I do have some questions; however, like my colleague from Kluane, I will stand down with regard to going into a lengthy debate with regard to the Women's Directorate budget line items, as we are running out of time and there are other larger departments that we communicated to be a priority, including the Department of Environment.

However, I think it is important that I get some questions to the minister about the budget line items in Vote 11 here today.

Back in February, the minister announced \$1.5 million — I realize this could be under the Department of Justice, but I see some connections to victim services and violence against women initiatives. There does seem to be a connection with the allocation of a couple hundred thousand dollars with the violence against women programming as well.

I guess my first question to the minister is: is there a connection between the Women's Directorate and the Department of Justice and this new initiative of hiring two new Victim Services workers over the next three years. Are they hired yet, and what are they expected to do, and what is the connection to the department or to the Women's Directorate's role?

Hon. Ms. Horne: There may be larger departments than the Women's Directorate, but there are none more important to the safety of women in Yukon than the Women's Directorate and the women's organizations in the Yukon. There is a social marketing analyst only for the Women's Directorate. They do not involve the Justice department's employees.

Mr. Elias: Now that the minister has mentioned the Women's Directorate and the new social marketing analyst position, can she go into some greater detail on what the job actually entails and what the goals and objectives of the positions are? I'm not even sure if this position has actually been occupied yet, so if she can go into some greater detail about what the position hopes to accomplish and what need it's addressing with regard to the Women's Directorate.

Hon. Ms. Horne: This position was filled last week and will commence June 1. There was an increase of \$136,000, which is the funding for the new social marketing analyst, which is part of the *Victims of Crime Strategy* and an increase to the administrative assistant position from 0.6 time to full-time, as I said in my opening remarks.

Mr. Elias: I thank the minister for that response. In her opening comments, the minister mentioned the Riverdale affordable housing project. She mentioned that it's going to be opened sometime this fall. I was wondering if she had a specific month and are people actually ready to occupy the building? If so, how many?

She also mentioned that the project is on time and under-budget, which is good news. During the consultations with regard to the Riverdale affordable housing project, I understand that community groups wanted a daycare in the facility. Is there going to be a daycare in that Riverdale affordable housing project? I've got those questions for the minister but, seeing the time, Mr. Chair, I move that we report progress.

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Elias that Committee of the Whole report progress.

Motion agreed to

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

Chair: It has been moved by Mr. Rouble that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

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

Chair's report

Mr. Nordick: Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 20, *First Appropriation Act, 2010-11*, and directed me to report progress.

Speaker: You have heard the report from the Chair of Committee of the Whole. Are you agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report carried.

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

The House adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled May 17, 2010:

10-1-165

Subsistence, Travel and Accommodations of Members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly, 2009-2010, Report on (dated April 2010) (Speaker Staffen)