



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 16

2nd Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Monday, November 29, 1982 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Andy Philipson, MLA, Whitehorse Porter Creek West

## CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Finance, Public Service Commission, and Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs, Highways, Yukon Housing Corporation, and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Renewable Resources, Government Services.
Hon. Clarke Ashley	Klondike	Minister responsible for Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Workers' Compensation.
Hon. Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South	Minister responsible for Education, Tourism, and Heritage and Cultural Resources.

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### (Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow
Andy Philipson	Whitehorse Porter Creek West

## OPPOSITION MEMBERS

### (New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West Leader of the Official Opposition
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre
Piers McDonald	Mayo
Dave Porter	Campbell

### (Independent)

Don Taylor	Watson Lake
------------	-------------

Clerk of the Assembly  
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)  
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)  
Sergeant-at-Arms  
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms  
Hansard Administrator

Patrick L. Michael  
Missy Follwell  
Jane Steele  
G.I. Cameron  
Frank Ursich  
Dave Robertson

**Whitehorse, Yukon**  
**Monday, November 29, 1982**

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

*Prayers*

## DAILY ROUTINE

## RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS FOR TABLING

**Mr. Speaker:** I have for tabling today an address by the hon. John C. Munro and a response by the hon. Chris Pearson.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further documents for tabling?  
 Are there any reports of committees?  
 Petitions?  
 Reading or receiving of petitions?  
 Are there any introduction of bills?

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**Mr. Penikett:** I move, seconded by the member for Whitehorse South Centre, that a bill, entitled *An Act to Provide for Freedom of Information*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, seconded by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, that a bill, entitled *An Act to Provide for Freedom of Information*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice, that a bill, entitled *Land Planning Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the hon. Minister of Justice, that a bill, entitled *Land Planning Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further bills for introduction?  
 Are there any notices of motion for the production of papers?  
 Notices of motion?  
 Are there any statements by ministers?  
 This then brings us to the question period.

## QUESTION PERIOD

### Question re: Land claims

**Mr. Penikett:** In his speech on Saturday the minister for Canada's northern colonies indicated that little in the way of land or resources will be transferred to this government following a land claims settlement, and later the government leader responded by raising questions about his future participation at land claims talks. I would like to ask: is it the government leader's intention to pull out of the talks or redefine its position at those talks as a result of the minister's announcement?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, it is not our intention. However, I think I made it clear on Saturday that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development did take us somewhat by surprise and that I, I think, reserve the right to seriously consider on behalf of this government what he did have to say to us and reply to it more fully in the future.

**Mr. Penikett:** The government leader has indicated that without a massive transfer of federal lands following the settlement, this government cannot agree to a settlement. I ask therefore is it this government's intention to oppose or obstruct an agreement-in-principle unless the federal government agrees to a transfer of most Yukon land to the territorial Crown?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I want to make it very clear, and I reiterate the statement that I made to the minister on Saturday, that I

perceive we were re-elected on a mandate of achieving a land claim settlement in this territory. It is the number one priority with us and we shall do that.

**Mr. Penikett:** The government leader will forgive those for thinking that it is also clear that his principal interest is in representing non-Indian interests of those talks. Why has this government and its negotiator so far failed to make clear the position of the Government of Yukon on this important point?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No. Mr. Speaker, rather than failing to represent the native people we have made the point over and over again that we are representing the Indian people and we are including them in those land negotiations for transfer of land after a settlement of land claims. If it would interest the leader of the opposition, the Council for Yukon Indians agrees with us and agrees with the stand that we have taken. They have taken the same stand publicly. What we are talking about is land for all Yukoners, native and non-native alike.

### Question re: Northern benefits

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question too, for the government leader, but on a different subject, emanating from the weekend.

Mr. Munro said on Saturday that he would release the details of his government's intention respecting the taxation regime of northern benefits if this was proving to be a stumbling block in the contract settlement at Cyprus Anvil. Did the federal minister discuss this prospect with the government leader and, if so, has the government leader any indication of the principles or details of that regime?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, it was not a topic of discussion; I do not have any details yet.

**Mr. Byblow:** Does, then, the government leader know whether this government or the Yukon public will be advised of those taxation details simultaneously, before or after they are delivered to the bargaining table?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have absolutely no idea.

**Mr. Byblow:** Since this government was a signatory to the four-party agreement six weeks ago towards a co-operative effort to reopen the mine, what specific appeal to that objective did the government leader make to the federal minister this past weekend?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We discussed the conciliation hearing that is going on now, the problem that Cyprus Anvil is not open, the apparent hesitation respecting coming to a firm decision on a negotiated agreement, but there were no firm decisions taken. It is the minister's contention that he has to have some sort of an indication from the management and the workers at Cyprus Anvil that there is going to be labour peace before he can proceed with going to Cabinet.

He indicated to me that he is now prepared — he has a document prepared — to go to Cabinet. However, it is his perception that to go without that indication of labour peace would be futile.

### Question re: Land use planning

**Mr. Porter:** I have a question. I do not know who is responsible clearly in this area; either the government leader or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I will read the question and the appropriate minister, I am sure, will respond.

At the present time there exists three distinct proposals for a land use planning process in the Yukon and recently we have heard some noise about a co-operative planning process. I would like to know if this government favours a co-operative planning process and, if so, what general process can we envision them setting up?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As that is my responsibility I will answer the question. Yes, we are interested in a co-operative planning process. I just introduced a bill today. If the member will get it at the first break, it will explain our position quite thoroughly.

**Mr. Porter:** Has the federal government invited this government to sit on a Yukon interim advisory planning committee and, if so, what is the government's position?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we have been invited to sit on a Yukon interim advisory committee to come up with a federal government position on land use planning. We are looking at that situation at the present time. We have not taken a position, pro or con, at this

time.

Very briefly, it is what I would consider not really beneficial to the residents of the Yukon Territory.

**Mr. Porter:** It seems that the minister has some reservations in respect to the committee. Can the minister tell us if he is in agreement with the responsibilities laid out for the interim committee and, if not, what are the general areas of disagreement?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think our position, as I said in answer to the first part of the question, is quite clear in the land use planning bill. I think that is our position and we, at this time, have no intention of deviating from it.

#### Question re: Highways

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the minister responsible for Highways. Since winter conditions have made the corner on the high point of Long Lake road even more dangerous, can the minister inform this House if his department is doing anything to correct the situation?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** My understanding is that they are looking at the possibility of putting a snow berm up there for the course of the winter.

#### Question re: Agriculture

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question to the government leader. I am prepared to devote one question to satisfy something that puzzles me greatly, and that is, which minister is responsible for Agriculture?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am always available and ready to answer any question the member wants to put forward to me.

**Mr. McDonald:** I can take it then that the Minister for Municipal and Community Affairs is responsible for Agriculture. Has the Agricultural Development Council received or solicited the request for agricultural plots in federal jurisdictions?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I trust this answer will not be too lengthy, yes.

**Mr. McDonald:** Another very short question. Which will determine final approval for agricultural plots: the Agricultural Development Council or regional land use committees?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** In the interim the Agricultural Development Council would. If the land use planning is incorporated and put into place, it will be a question of identification of those areas and the responsibility for disposition, of course, would lie with the Agricultural Development Council.

#### Question re: Aid package

**Mr. Penikett:** The government leader has previously said that he will let us know when the federal government replied to the \$13,000,000 aid package requested by the territory this September. I would like to ask the government leader, did the federal minister in effect say no to this request when he pointed out that Yukon receives, in per-capita terms, eight times the transfers of the average province?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, he did not, not at all.

**Mr. Penikett:** When the federal minister said he "will provide an incentive to increase revenue through sales tax or some other instrument", was he not in effect telling this government to raise the money itself? So I am forced to ask the government leader again if he is prepared to state categorically for the record again, that he does not plan to introduce sales tax or medicare premium increases in the next budget?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I am not prepared to say either that we will or we will not inaugurate or increase them. Those are decisions that are going to have to be made. I want to caution the leader of the opposition because I believe, indeed, that in his preamble to the question, he did misquote the minister.

**Mr. Penikett:** Perhaps I have a different copy of the text than the government leader. The federal minister still seems, and seemed in his announcements on Saturday, to prefer aid to Cyprus Anvil over the \$13,000,000 alternative proposal from this territory. Does the government leader agree with that federal position and if not, why not?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I believe in some convoluted manner the

leader of the opposition was asking me whether I agreed with the federal government supporting the opening of Cyprus Anvil. Yes I certainly do.

**Mr. Speaker:** I should pass along that questions asking for opinions are really not in order. Questions should be seeking information.

#### Question re: Tourism conference

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. In previous questioning the minister indicated that she did not intend any public dissemination of information surrounding the proceeding, the recommendations or highlights of the October tourism conference. Has the minister been able to re-evaluate this position? If so, could she clarify whether any public summary documents will be produced and circulated?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I do not believe I made that comment that it would not be made public. I said that there was no urgency for it to be made public immediately. As soon as we have the information compiled I am sure it will be made public. It has in a way already because I am sure the YVA and the KVA members have seen certain suggestions or recommendations that were made from the tourism conference.

**Mr. Byblow:** In fact, at the November 18th YVA board of directors meeting the minister's deputy head reported that a summary report of the tourism conference was nearly ready and perhaps today is. Can the minister assure that this will be a public document?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Sure.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like at least a half dozen copies. I would like to continue in my final supplementary to ask the minister, with respect to the recommendations emanating from the tourism conference, what process does the minister intend in order to evaluate and implement the main recommendations coming from that conference?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Some of the main recommendations have already been implemented in the negotiations for the new tourism agreement with the Government of Canada. Other than that we will probably be re-evaluating the tourism strategy plan of 1978 and maybe updating that to conform with the economic time.

#### Question re: Wolf poisoning

**Mr. Porter:** My question is to the minister responsible for Renewable Resources. In order to poison wolves, the government must obtain permission from the federal government. Has this permission been granted and were there any problems encountered during the process?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** When the issue rose previously, I stated that we had to have permission from the federal government. We have since had the legal opinion that we do not have to have permission from the federal government; however, I am not aware of exactly what is going on in my department. I understand there is some problem with the federal government, but, as of this time, it is not going to hold back our program.

**Mr. Porter:** In view of the minister's government's idea of an open government, why did the minister not consult with his appointed wildlife advisory committee prior to the decision to poison wolves?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The Wildlife Advisory Committee is not a committee to tell me what I have to do. The advisory committee is there to give advice on positions this government should take or to give advice on positions that it has taken. As soon as we developed our program to an extent that we could present it to the Wildlife Advisory Committee, it was presented. The time frame for the presentation was short because we are in a pressing rush to try to get some method in process to handle the wolf situation. That was the reason for it being so slow. I must say, again, that the wildlife advisory committee is just that; it is an advisory committee.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister assure the public and the members of the committee that he will not, in the future, attempt to use the committee simply as a rubber-stamp for government policy?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I will rule that question out of order as being argumentative.

**Question re: Highways**

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the minister responsible for Highways. Section 85 of the *Municipal Act* states that "no encroachment or nuisance shall be caused or created by any person on any highway within a municipality". Can the minister inform this House if his department has considered this section in regard to the blockade in the shipyard area road?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I sought legal advice on the situation of the closure of the road that is on private property in the shipyard area and it is my understanding from the legal opinion that I was given that we have no right to go through that particular piece of property or, for that matter, the member's property, unless he or she agrees.

**Mrs. Joe:** Under the *Highways Act*, the highway definition includes a road, street, thoroughfare, avenue, whether publicly or privately owned, any part of which the public is ordinarily entitled or permitted to use for the passage of vehicles.

Is the minister aware that residents of the shipyard area made another road adjacent to the blocked-up portion and that another barrier was set up to prevent cars from driving through?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, I was not.

**Mrs. Joe:** The alternate route, which is along the river bank, has become extremely dangerous. Can the minister inform this House if he will once again investigate this problem?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** If there is something new that has to be raised, I will be more than prepared to look at it.

**Question re: Agricultural land**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the government leader. On Saturday, the hon. John Munro clearly stated that there would be no transfers of agricultural land to the Government of Yukon before a comprehensive planning process was in place. On Thursday, November 25, the government leader said that the agricultural land selection will come before a land use plan. Will the government leader now admit that there will be no agricultural lands forthcoming prior to a land use plan in place?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would not admit that at all, because I honestly do not know. I am not prepared to accept, as a statement of fact, that the minister clearly stated anything on Saturday.

**Mr. McDonald:** The government leader said recently that once an agricultural policy was made public, the federal government would have to transfer federal land. As the federal government has now said that it has no intention of transferring land on the basis of the Yukon Government's Agricultural Policy, will the government leader admit that a land use plan must be established first?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, not at all.

**Mr. McDonald:** Again, to the government leader. Will the government commit to the people of Yukon the willingness to develop a co-operative land use plan and a new agricultural policy so that Yukoners can finally receive land for agricultural purposes?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have to remind the hon. member that under daily routine today, when it came to the introduction of bills, the responsible minister tabled, and gave first reading to, a bill called *Land Use Planning*. I do not know what else I can do at this point in time.

**Question re: Constitutional development**

**Mr. Penikett:** May I remind the government leader that last week he told us that agricultural land selection was going ahead in advance of a plan.

The federal minister's speech on Saturday, for the first time, officially tied land claims negotiations to discussions of constitutional development. Since the government leader has, in the past, refused to discuss matters under negotiation at these talks, will there now be a policy of secrecy on constitutional questions in this House?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Once again, I think I have to remind the leader of the opposition that I took issue with that statement made by the minister at that time and I have not changed my opinion any, in respect to that issue.

**Mr. Penikett:** I thank the government leader for his reply. In the government leader's reply to the minister on Saturday, he noted

that several constitutional guarantees for Indian people have been agreed to at the negotiations. I would like to ask the government leader when shall these constitutional questions or agreements be brought to this House, which has previously expressed the desire for public, open and consensual constitutional discussions?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** At the time that it is agreed that there is an agreement-in-principle or at the time there is mutual agreement at the table that these agreements will be made public, then and only then will they be made public. It is a fact that there are some constitutional issues which directly affect the Indian people of this territory that have been discussed at land claims negotiations. When land claims negotiations began, we anticipated that would not happen. It is now a fact of life and it does not seem that the minister realized that when he said it on Saturday.

**Mr. Penikett:** Given that, by ministerial edict, until final agreement is reached — not agreement-in-principle — the *Yukon Act*, our constitution, is to be renegotiated in secret by the federal Liberals, territorial Conservatives and the Yukon Indians, what role or consultation will there be or will this House have in that process, including the opposition party, which represents one-third of the people of this territory?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Speaker, the opposition does not represent one-third of the people of this territory. This government represents all of the people of the territory. That is a fact of life.

**Question re: Faro boundary expansion**

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a question I will direct to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. This government has had some previous discussions with the Town of Faro and Cyprus Anvil Mining Corporation regarding expanded municipal boundaries which were intended to include the mine property within the municipality. Can the minister say whether these discussions are continuing and whether a municipal boundary expansion is being contemplated, developed or is in progress and expected for Faro in the near future?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is my understanding at the present time that those discussions are not continuing.

**Mr. Byblow:** Related to the same topic, can the minister confirm that this government presently accrues in the order of \$900,000 per year in taxation of Cyprus Anvil mining property at Faro?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I do not have that information. I will have to take notice on the question.

**Mr. Byblow:** Could the minister then clarify for me the present government policy that establishes taxation rates for mining properties in the territory; that is, of operations that exist outside municipal jurisdictions?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It is assessed under the *Assessment and Taxation Act* of the Yukon Territory and is taxed accordingly.

**Question re: West coast fishery talks**

**Mr. Porter:** My question is to the government leader. About three weeks ago, I asked the government leader a question about the west coast fishery talks, and seeing as how those talks are about to conclude, can the government leader tell the House as to the success of his representation to the negotiating bodies on the very important issue of the Yukon fishery resource?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Approximately two or three days ago, we received the first communication we have had from the federal government regarding the fishery discussions being held in Vancouver; the talks were to start today. I am not sure just exactly whether my department could get the information together that they needed to go to those meetings, but my deputy minister was instructed that if he could get enough information together and get somebody down there, that he was to attend.

I must stress that it was only on Friday that my department was told about the meeting and what it was dealing with.

**Mr. Porter:** Failing to send the deputy minister to these talks in Vancouver, would the minister undertake to make specific representations to the federal Minister of Fisheries to have included in those talks an agreement with respect to the Yukon fishery resource?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, I will certainly express that opinion to the federal people; we have expressed it before and we will continue to do so.

**Question re: Agriculture**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the minister responsible for Agriculture. The honourable John Munro stated, on Saturday, that a co-operative land use planning process was scheduled to begin. Can the minister state whether it is this government's position to make the selection of agricultural land a priority over recreational and residential land?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would assume, once a land use planning exercise was put into place, all different types of lands would be identified. It is our policy, at the present time, that an individual must go out to the areas that he or she is interested in, convince the Agriculture Development Council of its agricultural potential and, subsequently, the application will be heard and processed.

I assume that that particular procedure will continue in the foreseeable future. It is not our position that a person should have to wait three or four years while the various levels of the civil service make decisions on their behalf.

**Mr. McDonald:** Will the minister undertake to make public the deliberations of any co-operative land use planning process on an ongoing basis?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** This is a responsibility of the Minister of Renewable Resources. It is not my responsibility.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am being subjected to a shell game here, but in any case, will the government be submitting a pamphlet, "Land: a Yukon Resource", to whichever minister would like to answer, about his position at the co-operative planning sessions, or the verbal policy of individual land selection enunciated on November 18th?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I wish the member would listen to what is being said from this side of the House. It is obvious that he has written questions. He has not even listened to the answers we have given him previously. Under the new *Land Planning Act* that was introduced today, the member will find all of the procedures that are needed to take place in order to plan land in the territory. I would suggest that he wait until he has read the act.

**Mr. Speaker:** There being no further questions we shall proceed to orders of the day. May I have your further pleasure?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the hon. Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole.

*Motion agreed to*

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I would like to call Committee of the Whole to order. We will have a short break.

*Recess*

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order.

*Government Services — continued*

**Mr. Byblow:** I think when we left off last day, I was enquiring of the minister what buildings this government rents. I would like to pursue that for a moment and ask the minister if there are any properties outside this particular building and land that the government owns for the purpose of government services in the City of Whitehorse.

I believe he listed for me the other day the properties that are rented and that is fine. I am curious about ownership beyond this building and this section of land.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There are a few buildings. We own buildings throughout the territory: all the administration buildings,

most of the liquor stores, places such as the old Wolf Creek Centre, we own all of the buildings in the Marwell area, including the highways' garage — the highways' garage is not in government services. The liquor store building is in government services and we lease it to Yukon Liquor Corporation. We have numerous buildings all over the territory.

**Mr. Byblow:** Could the minister then advise me what I ought to do if I wanted to get a listing of properties in Whitehorse? I realize the properties outside of Whitehorse, in the communities, are quite specific, in most instances, because they relate to a single agency of the government in the community and primarily, in most cases, the liquor outlet. Within the city, could he direct me where I ought to go to get a listing?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** All you have to do is phone up government services, ask for it, and they will give it to you.

**Mr. Byblow:** On the general subject, I have another area I want to explore with the minister. It relates to a number of enquiries, and one primary one, that I have had, and that is on the supply of janitorial equipment and supplies for the purposes of janitorial duties in government buildings, in schools, in the properties that we identified earlier. Perhaps the minister could outline to me, for the record, the advice I can give to enquiries of people who wish to provide those supplies?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think everybody is well aware that every once in awhile you see in the paper, tenders for janitorial supplies. All of the janitorial supplies are tendered. It is also a good idea for suppliers, or tentative suppliers, if they have any information, or they are bringing on new product lines, or whatever, to make sure that the Department of Supply Services has the information from these organizations to know what they have and what is available. When it comes up for tender, it is all looked at. The whole broad spectrum of everything that these suppliers have made known to my department is looked at. Basically, it all comes out of the tender process and they have to win the tender.

**Mr. Byblow:** In relation to one specific enquiry of a local business that has undertaken to produce, from bulk chemicals, their own agents for cleaning supplies, I would want to enquire of the minister if the tender contract is broken down specific enough that a business, or an individual, could bid on just a small portion of this broad supply of janitorial supplies?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, when the tender comes out for janitorial supplies, any supplier in the Yukon Territory, or anywhere else for that matter, can bid on any part of that janitorial supply that they want to supply.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just further to that, at what time of the year are these tenders put out? Is this in preparation for the new fiscal year? In other words, are the tenders going to be out next February, the next time, for the following year or do they come out more periodically and in smaller quantities?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Well, for economies of scale, we usually have one or two tenders each year. Usually one, and usually it comes out in the spring or early summer.

**Mr. Byblow:** Probably my final question on janitorial supply; when the tender is prepared, does it relate to the total supply throughout the territory of that particular product, or that particular material, or is it related to an individual sector of the government; that is, an individual building or region?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it is usually on a government-wide basis. It is usually a fairly large supply. It is sometimes tendered on more than one occasion, because we do use such a volume that it would not be kept in stock. In a lot of cases, the successful contractor who wins that contract makes sure that he has enough on hand to keep the government supplied.

**Mr. Byblow:** On the same subject again, is it possible, through the method that the government uses for the supply of these products, for the winning tender to supply it periodically through the year? He does not have to have the total year's supply on hand; that, in fact, he commits to provide the government its necessary quantities periodically through the year for whatever product that he is supplying?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** He is not required for example, if we ordered 10,000 cases of toilet paper — to supply all at one time. It

is broken down, and they keep us in steady supply.

*On Administration*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The basic change in most of this budget, as in most of the other budgets, are the nine-day fortnight and also, in this department, which has been really significantly changed, because of the changes that were made after the election — the realignment of different responsibilities in the government — Government Services acquired Public Works and it also acquired contract administration; Public Affairs Bureau has been spun off to the Executive Council Office. There are quite a few changes in this budget. As we go through, if there are any specific questions, I will answer them at that time.

**Mr. Byblow:** Can the minister just provide the positions of the four person-years and, perhaps, just very briefly, something to describe their responsibilities?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The four person-years are the departmental administrator, clerk typist III, who is secretary to the deputy minister, the clerk typist II and the funding clerk.

*Administration in the amount of \$161,000 agreed to*

*On Systems and Computing Services*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is one department that has had significant change in it. I think most members are aware that it has been very short staffed. We have taken all of the computing services in the Government of Yukon Territory and concentrated them in this area. We have done an awful lot of work. We are finally off of the old computer and have everything now on the new computer. My department now can concentrate more on programs for various departments, rather than what they have had to do, which is get all the programs off the old computer on to the new one, which was very time-consuming.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just an observation in comparing the person-years presently to the ones that were anticipated this spring. I notice that there is an increase of one. I would assume from what the minister has indicated that the work-load has, in fact, increased, though I am not sure why that would be if we are now plugged into the new system and we no longer have to do the same level of programming and preparatory work to get the system on-line. Perhaps the minister could explain the increase?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The work-load has increased. Contrary to the person across the floor, who tends to disagree, we have had, up until now, 19 positions. In fact, we have more coming by January. We have some extra positions that are uncounted in this department. But there are nine extra positions which were unlisted. Those people who we do have in the department were spending almost all of their time trying to get off the old system and onto the new system.

Now we have the capability to do some of the programs for the various departments that we could not do before because of lack of manpower. And the increase of one man-year has come about from the transfer of one man-year from Renewable Resources, a biometrician, who was in Renewable Resources, was transferred into Government Services because we feel that he was not being fully utilized in his position as a biometrician in Renewable Resources, and actually we could use him much more beneficially in Government Services in systems and computing.

**Mr. Byblow:** Thank you. The next question I have is to enquire of the minister the connection of the Systems and Computing Branch as it is contained within a framework of administration. What is the relationship with ERPU and the economic calculations, assessments, and computing that is done for their needs.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The ERPU group does their own. It functions through the main computer, but they do their own computing. That is not done by my department. They have their own computer operator to work on that function of their business.

**Mr. Byblow:** Are we facing a particular problem in respect to the recruitment and hiring for the, from what the minister has said, quite large number of vacancies, historically, and even presently.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we are in a position where we have to

compete with all the businesses throughout the country. Everybody in the country is going to into computers and they have a great demand for computer operators and computer programmers. We have to compete with all of them. We have been very successful in the last month or so, out of about nine positions that were empty, we now have six of them filled or about to be filled.

**Mr. Byblow:** Perhaps a tour would have answered this question: is this branch contained in one area of the building or is it scattered throughout the departments?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it is concentrated now where Government Services was. The administration of Government Services has moved upstairs to the third floor; systems computing is all in the area where government services was before.

*Administration in the amount of \$143,000 agreed to*

*On Computer Services*

*Computer Services, in the amount of \$637,000, agreed to*

*On Systems Analysis*

*Systems Analysis, in the amount of \$293,000, agreed to*

*On Programming*

*Programming, in the amount of \$94,000, agreed to*

*Systems and Computing Services in the amount of \$1,167,000 agreed to*

*On Supply Services*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is a very large part of the Department of Government Services. This is the department that does all the purchasing, controls the assets of the government and it also handles such things as all of our travel arrangements and pool cars. This is the main function of Government Services, other than the Department of Public Works.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is it customary for Supply Services to maintain an inventory of supplies that are procured through public tender for any specific government needs? I am talking about the kind of materials and supplies that turn over and are in regular use; it goes back to my earlier question to the minister of whether the supplier provides these periodically throughout the year or we have a large asset inventory of supplies.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Most of the supplies supplied to this government are supplied directly from the distributor or the local wholesaler. We do have some supplies, but not enough to amount to anything of significance.

**Mr. Byblow:** Where would these be contained? What building? In the Marwell area, I would assume?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Most of the supply services are in, I believe, Building Number 273, in the Marwell area; that is the headquarters for Supply Services and that is where it would be stored.

**Mr. Byblow:** I just want to pursue, in a general way, something I have approached the minister on previously, and that is the Transportation Co-ordination Branch that has sprung up in government in the last couple of years. I did have some complaints from the travel industry that this was an unnecessary function; that it cannot, in any way, save money; that, in fact, it duplicates work simply because of the ticketing procedure that is still being followed.

<sup>17</sup> I realize it will come under as a line-item, perhaps, later, but I would like to hear from the minister some justification or qualification for that branch coming into existence and perhaps his government's intention for its continuation.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The transportation and the ticketing process that we have, contrary to what he says, does save us a significant amount of money every year. You might say that we are duplicating what happens in a travel agency, but that is not necessarily so. Through being able to have our own computer system in the government, we are able to take advantage of all the low prices that we can get. We work out our total travel program the same as a travel agency would do, but we can take advantage of the lowest possible prices, which is something the travel agencies could not do. For example, we can take advantage of economy or excursion

fares that the travel agents could not get for us. We never did, until we put this system in progress, take advantage of those fares. It was mostly because we did not want to take the opportunities away from other people who were travelling from Yukon to outside. For example if there are four people on an excursion fare and we happen to have them booked, we can drop them and go on a regular rate. That is one distinct advantage. That advantage alone saves us about \$20,000 a year, so contrary to public opinion we do save a significant amount of money, in the \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year range from having this in here. We do not, and have not, any intention of taking any business away from the travel agents. The travel agents do all the ticketing. All we do is work out the travel schedule.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think the minister has previously established the point that there was no competition involved with private enterprise. The question that was raised was twofold: one, that it was duplication, an unnecessary service being provided by government that could have been provided by the travel agency and, two, that it would eventually result in travel arrangements being made totally by government down the road which would eventually eliminate the travel agencies.

One point that has been brought to me and I just want to touch on this with the minister; how is the government convinced that it does save money if a travel agency has knowledgeable trained people, has full access to the industry and all agencies across the country, and in fact the world, and how can a small one- or two-man branch of the government tap into that and find a better deal? That is the argument that has been presented to me.

<sup>18</sup> I wonder if the minister would respond to that.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think I did respond to it. I told the member across the floor one example of how we save money, by using the excursion fares that we could not utilize before because one of the complaints of the travel agencies was that we were constantly, for example, changing our flight plans and things like that. I should also point out to the member that now, by utilizing this system, we are also guaranteeing outside travel agencies, outside of Whitehorse, in Watson Lake, Faro and Dawson City for example, that they get their fair share of the business. If we are going to have people travel out of those areas we give them the right to write the ticket. Previously, it was mostly done from Atlas Travel or Yukon Travel, here in Whitehorse. It has the distinct advantage of also diversifying and spreading the money out across the territory through all the businesses.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just extending from this debate about that branch, I want to advise the minister of something that keeps cropping up, every now and again, relative to the business of government personnel travelling.

This particular complaint seems to emanate most often from Health and Human Resources, and that is when a patient has to travel from an outlying community into hospital here in Whitehorse, because of the need now to go through this branch for authorizing that particular travel warrant, there seems to be the problem of securing that ticket: especially on a weekend and, of course, I expect it also affects fortnight Fridays. Has the minister been made aware of some of these problems and is there an expeditious way that this particular problem can be handled more expeditiously. I think, in practical terms, what often happens is that a patient has to travel and the airline has to take that person on virtually free until all the paperwork is done. Perhaps the minister could respond.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, contrary to that position, that is not what happens. On a weekend, or at night, or at any time, whenever it is necessary for a person to travel — usually the reason for travelling under Health and Human Resources is that it is a medical evacuation — the ticket is at the airport. CP Air or Trans North or whoever is flying the transportation is not required to get the ticket ahead of time. The ticket is sitting there waiting and it can be authorized in those emergency circumstances without having to previously go through our whole process here in the government.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am reassured to hear that. I suppose that I will admit that I have not heard of the problem in the last couple of months so, perhaps, it has been tidied up. On the business of

distributing the travel business around the agencies in the communities around the territory, the present policy, I understand, calls for the community, if it has an agency, to issue that particular ticket for that particular travelling purpose; that is, exclusive of the medical evacuation.

<sup>19</sup> Is that still the policy in the outlying communities?

Beyond that, my second question is; what is the policy relative to distribution of the business in Whitehorse?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I said earlier, yes, the business that comes from Faro comes out of the Faro travel agency; the business in Watson Lake comes from the Watson Lake travel agency; Dawson City the same way. The business in Whitehorse is split up on a three-way basis and is spread equally amongst the operators in Whitehorse.

*Administration, in the amount of \$121,000, agreed to*

#### *On Purchasing*

**Mr. Byblow:** What is the \$182,000 for? He does not have to break it down, but is this for paying for the tender awards of supplies to government? I just want a general answer, not a breakdown.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I believe it is for such things as telephones, rental of machinery and office equipment, repairs and maintenance for office equipment, materials and supplies for the office. It is all relative to the personnel who we have in that division.

*Purchasing, in the amount of \$182,000, agreed to*

#### *On Queen's Printer.*

*Queen's Printer, in the amount of \$545,000, agreed to*

#### *On Asset Control*

*Asset Control, in the amount of \$54,000, agreed to*

#### *On Transportation and Communications*

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I have already given notice of my question in this area with regard to service contract SO7002 last year: what was the total amount expended for the taxi contract and what is the estimate for taxis this year?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The cost, from January to December, 1981, was \$20,209.40 for chauffeur service. The fact that we brought in a chauffeur service for \$20,000 has allowed us to dispense with ten vehicles in our transportation fleet. So, I think, just to put two and two together, all the members across the floor can recognize that that is a significant saving to us.

<sup>20</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** The question is not totally answered. It was my information, as of March 30th, 1982, that the amount expended was \$27,882.85. Is the minister saying that that is inaccurate, and what is the estimate for next year?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, I am not saying that is inaccurate. He asked me at the time how much is expended and from January, 1981 until December of 1981 it was \$20,000; up until March, it was another \$7,000. From January to October of this year, we have spent \$24,523.63 for the chauffeur service.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am interested in the calendar figures of the service contract for the fiscal year. Are the contracts in fiscal years or calendar years?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know. From the information that I have in front of me here, I would think that it is on a calendar-year basis because of the figures from January to October and January to December. But I do not know if it really makes a heck of a lot of difference what fiscal-year basis it is on. It does not change the figures any.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What is the amount estimated for 1982-83?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That was one number that I did not get, but I believe it is in the neighbourhood of \$27,000 or \$28,000.

*Transportation and Communications in the amount of \$554,000 agreed to*

#### *On Warehouse*

**Mr. Byblow:** I am curious as to how this particular category qualifies as a vote, and for what?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I said earlier, we do do some warehous-



ing and it is also part of the Supply Services; it controls the assets, and, for example, we do have quite a significant amount of paper materials for the Yukon government, and we do store some janitorial supplies and such other things as warehouse equipment. We do have some warehousing obviously, we could not operate a government by being totally supplied from the private sector. We have to have some storage.

**Mr. Byblow:** This is clearly warehousing outside this building and outside of rented space?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This warehousing is done in our complex down in the Marwell area.

*Warehouse in the amount of \$160,000 agreed to*

#### *On Records Management*

*Records Management in the amount of \$375,000 agreed to*

*Supply Services in the amount of \$1,991,000 agreed to*

#### *On Public Works*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I stated earlier, this department was moved over from Highways and Public Works. It was moved into my department and we have reorganized the Department of Government Services and we have now placed property management and safety and security and emergency measures, in this Department of Public Works. It is almost impossible, for example, to compare Public Works with Public Works of last year. We are starting out on a new basis. If there are any specific questions that I can answer, I will do my best to do so.

**Mr. Byblow:** My first question is a general one. Under Public Works used to be the aspect of engineering for Public Works facilities; in other words a component within government that scrutinized and oversaw development of various buildings and structures. I want to relate that to some questions that I raised with the minister earlier on the Faro school. As the minister provided the information and, as I understand it, the responsibility for correction to the foundation deficiencies rests with this government. I find it very peculiar that this government is left responsible for an improperly constructed building; improperly constructed because there ought to have been some responsibility placed on the designers of that structure. In other words, whoever did the preparatory work to determine what kind of a foundation is going to carry that load should bear the responsibility in the long term for any deficiencies there are. That is part of the professional standards of architects, designers and engineers. Could the minister tell me why this government is responsible now for correction?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am not an expert on engineering, by any means; all I can do, as I did previously when the member asked a question, is ask my department whether we were responsible or not. They say that, no, the contracting and the engineering was done according to the specifications.

Certainly, if there was any chance at all that we had a come-back on either the engineers or the contractor, we would be looking at it. Perhaps they are still investigating the engineering part of it. I am not sure, but, to the best of my knowledge, and from my department, I was told that it is our responsibility. That is the only answer I can give the member; if he wants to hear something else I do not know how I can tell him.

**Mr. Byblow:** I do not think there is anything different that the minister can tell me, if this government is responsible for correction to that facility but does not know why it is responsible. Somewhere there is something wrong. In principle we have what appears to be either an injustice or a deficiency in the process.

I could raise the suspicion that this government, at some point, changed the plans and, therefore, the obligation of the design architects fell away. I would only leave it with the minister to, perhaps, explore if that happened. It just seems to me that they should not be responsible for paying for the correction to that building; granted they could be doing the work, but not necessarily paying the bill.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member can rest assured that, if there is any way that we can attach blame for the fact that we have to come up with some more money to do some maintenance on a new

building, we will certainly be doing it.

**Mr. Byblow:** I want to know, on a new topic in this area, something more about the nature of the security afforded to the government buildings and property. Perhaps, rather than reveal my ignorance, I will leave it to the minister to tell me what security system is in place by which monitoring is done of the facilities here in Whitehorse.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I misunderstood the member at the start; I thought he was talking about security on contracts. I understand you are talking about security of buildings from breaking and entering and vandalism.

For example, if you were at the new school in Porter Creek, you would see that there are infrared detectors, there are movement detectors — there are detectors in there whereby nobody could even move in that building without the security knowing about it.

We also have some of those security measures in place in some of the other buildings. We are constantly upgrading some of those so that we do have security.

Another example of security at the Porter Creek school is that, if any window or door is broken or touched, it automatically sets off the security alarm. Unfortunate as it is, we have to provide this type of security in order to protect our buildings and we are adding those to other buildings as time goes by.

**Mr. Byblow:** So this sophisticated machinery that is in place in the Porter Creek school is not necessarily in place in all of the other government buildings. What the minister did not indicate, that I was seeking, was whether there is a central control and monitoring reporting system, or checking system, of all the government properties in town. I would assume, from what he described about the Porter Creek school, that that is connected to some central office for monitoring. I assume, also, within this building, that there is a central control. How does the total security system, in Whitehorse, interconnect?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I may be wrong in this respect. I am not totally sure. I could find out for sure, but I believe most of that reporting does come down here to the central security in this building. For example, if someone were to break into the Porter Creek school, it would be reported here and certainly in the police station.

#### *On Property Management Administration*

*Property Management Administration in the amount of \$38,000 agreed to*

#### *On Property Management Operations*

**Mr. Byblow:** As being the largest single item in this vote, what is entailed in management operations? Are we talking about utilities? What are we spending this amount on, as a category?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, this is all about the property management of all of our buildings. It is utilities, lights and heat for our buildings. I could go on for quite a few minutes outlining all of our expenses, but this is what it is. It is the janitorial and the property management of all of our buildings.

*Property Management Operations in the amount of \$1,665,000 agreed to*

#### *On Property Management Chargebacks*

**Mr. Byblow:** I understand what a chargeback is. I would be curious as to whom are you billing these internal chargebacks?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Because the Yukon Liquor Corporation is a separate corporation, there is a chargeback to them and, because Workers' Compensation Board is a separate organization, there is a chargeback to them; those are the two chargebacks.

*Property Management Chargebacks in the amount of a recovery in the amount of \$117,000 agreed to*

#### *On Safety and Security*

*Safety and Security in the amount of \$33,000 agreed to*

#### *On Emergency Measures Organization*

*Emergency Measures in the amount of \$26,000 agreed to*

#### *On Building Maintenance Administration*

*Building Maintenance in the amount of \$99,000 agreed to*

*On Building Maintenance Operations*

**Mr. Byblow:** Again, we have got the second largest single item relating to the operation of our government facilities. Now, the minister indicated that in the first operations item it dealt with utilities and janitorial and so on. Now we have a maintenance, which I assume is just a slight shift of the type of work; again, in the operation of the facilities. Could the minister clarify if this, now, is upgrading or maintaining the level of physical structure?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is exactly what it is: it is for things such as painting and plumbing, maintenance and whatever other maintenance needs to be done in the building — repairs to the boiler system, or whatever, in any of our buildings.

*Building Maintenance Operations in the amount of \$1,270,000 agreed to*

*On Building Maintenance Chargebacks*

*Building Maintenance Chargebacks in the amount of a recovery of \$160,000, agreed to*

*On Project Administration*

*Project Administration, in the amount of \$103,000, agreed to*

*Public Works in the amount of \$2,957,000 agreed to*

*On Revenue and Recoveries*

**Mr. Byblow:** I am curious about just the one figure: the \$84,000 on third party recoveries. I would be curious whether this is under lease of space or just what?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, this is for rent recovered from government buildings rented to other agencies, such as the Liquor Corporation. The reason we have this recovery is because we charge them a little more rent in order to cover our operation and maintenance costs.

**Mr. Byblow:** So, it relates to an internal chargeback set-up, again; it is not commercial leasing?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No.

<sup>25</sup> We do in some cases, such as the LID offices in Watson Lake, for example, apply a chargeback, but it is not renting space to a private industry.

**Mr. Byblow:** So that I do not make an assumption, is it correct that the government does not lease space, or any of its property around the territory, to private enterprise for shop space or that type of activity?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, to my knowledge we do not rent to any private industry.

*Department of Government Services in the amount of \$6,276,000 agreed to*

**On Department of Renewable Resources**

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** In 1982-83 the department has been able to continue its efforts in developing a solid data base to assist government in making wise and long-term decisions respecting present and future uses of our public and renewable resources.

Substantial spending increases are therefore indicated under the federal-territorial subsidiary agreement, which is shared on a sixty-forty basis with the federal government. Significant increases are also contemplated under the auspices of the Yukon River Basis Study.

As the government leader announced, our government is going to take the lead and an effective role in the land use planning in Yukon. In fact, the land use planning bill was tabled today. In fulfilling this commitment, the collection and analysis of our important resource inventories is essential. Notwithstanding this increased expenditure, the department was able to achieve an overall expenditure reduction of five percent.

In keeping with our thrust to develop logical, long-term plans respecting the utilization of our resources, the department should

have completed, by the end of the year, regional land use plans in areas such as the Dempster highway corridor and Kluane, and also some work on our northern Yukon resource management model.

<sup>26</sup> Under the resource core program, our new conservation officer facilities and compounds will be completed in Mayo, Watson Lake, Haines Junction and Dawson City. With these secured compounds, it will now be possible to aware campground firewood cutting contracts in the fall, thereby creating winter employment for some of our people in the territory who are in great need of it. Work should commence on this within the next week or so if, in fact, it has not commenced already. I believe, perhaps, that it has.

I am also pleased to say that our Auxiliary Conservation Officer Program has been an overwhelming success. Approximately 90 citizens throughout the territory have volunteered their services. Some 71 have now completed a training and orientation program. I am also pleased to announce that our very important Wildlife Advisory Committee has been increased from seven to nine and I am particularly pleased with the Council for Yukon Indians finally nominating persons to that committee. Two of the nine members of the committee are of Indian extraction.

As acknowledged earlier, the department will be undertaking a wolf control program, which I announced last week. In its support of this government's desire to encourage agriculture in Yukon, the department was successful in encouraging Agriculture Canada in establishing its presence in Yukon. It is my understanding that a pedologist, or soil specialist, will be on staff in Yukon around the first of December of this year.

It has been a very busy year in this department and I will be happy to answer any questions that the members across the floor will be interested in putting to me.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to speak about the various problems that exist within this particular department. I think that this department, above many other departments of the government, has come under a great deal of public scrutiny recently. A great many questions have been raised about the ability of the department to manage in a judicious fashion the resources of the Yukon, particularly in respect to the wildlife resources of the Yukon.

Questions have been raised about wolf management and, particularly, about personnel management. First of all, I would like to deal with the whole issue of personnel management. The case that is brought to mind most recently is the case of Mr. Jerry Michalski. No one yet seems to know why Mr. Michalski was fired; at least, no one that I have talked to. Possibly the minister can enlighten me and tell me the reason so that I, in turn, can return to Mr. Michalski and inform him as to why he was dismissed. Given the absence of a reason as to the dismissal of Mr. Michalski, I think we can only speculate as to why such drastic action was taken.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Point of order. It has been stated in this House previously that it is impossible for me, in my position as the minister responsible, to explain why Mr. Michalski was terminated from this government. The member across the floor is trying to make political points on this when I am unable to respond. There is a mechanism for dealing with these complaints and the final appeal that Mr. Michalski has is the courts. The member is well aware of that and he is not benefiting himself or me or anyone else by raising this question that I am unable to answer.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is not a legitimate point of order. If the minister declines to answer, that is the minister's prerogative, but if the question is asked, even if it is asked over and over again, that is our prerogative. It is not a point of order at all.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** He can ask the question, but the minister does not have to answer it.

**Mr. Porter:** Yes, that is quite alright.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** You should not give the particulars. This is general debate.

**Mr. Porter:** In continuing with the general debate, I would say that because of the refusal of the minister and members of government not to answer questions in respect to Mr. Michalski's dismissal, we can only speculate as to why he was dismissed from his position. Could it have been because of the fact that Mr.

Michalski had a 100 percent conviction rate, that he was an example to the rest of the officers within the department as to how he carried out his duties, or is it because he was respected by members of the Ross River community for the kind of work that he did in that community? Or was it because of the fact that he got up one Sunday morning, his day off, for which he would not have received pay, and assisted a foreign tourist to get a hunting licence? Or worse yet, what could have happened is that Mr. Michalski could have been a victim of bureaucratic in-fighting. He could have been despised by someone in the department who was jealous of the competence exhibited by Mr. Michalski and simply made a decision to terminate his services within the government. I put it very much in the hypothetical sense.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the budget here. We are not dealing with what has happened to some person in this department. We are dealing with the budget.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I think that is a point well taken.

**Mr. Porter:** On a point of order, we are dealing with the budget and, as I understand it, the budget deals with expenditures undertaken by government. Here we have a decision made by the government that will have the result of further expenditure undertaken by this government. There is going to be, as we understand it, legal costs initiated by the government and it will go on for quite some time, depending on how long the government will decide to carry out the action.

I think it is important that these kinds of cases be brought before the public, brought before this legislature, debated and spoken of, because they do project the kinds of views that the government has in respect to how it carries out its business and they do project the kind of policies this government carries out. I think that we do have a right, as members of the legislature, to raise questions and speak about these issues.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** This is not related to the budget. I would love to get out of this hot seat. How about a short break?

*Mr. Chairman resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order. We are on general debate. If there are any more questions of the same type, I would appreciate it if they are brought up at the appropriate time. We will still continue, please, on the general debate of the budget and have questions on the budget only.

**Mr. Porter:** I did have a whole line of questioning about this incident that has taken place in the government. But, in view of the ruling that has been made by the now-departed Deputy Chairman, and in terms of your acquiescence, in general, to the ruling that he has made that we discontinue this line of questioning, I would do so, but in conclusion, I would like to state that these kinds of questions are important questions because they do affect the lives of people. This particular individual involved has had to relocate and has had to find other employment. His family has suffered. His reputation as a competent individual has suffered as well. These kinds of questions are very necessary and should be addressed. If you will let me continue, I will move on.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It is very easy for the member across the floor, knowing that I cannot respond because of the legal position that this government is in, to make accusations. All I can say is that I will welcome Mr. Michalski taking his claim to court so that this government has an opportunity to put its position forward. He has put this government, as the member across the floor is aware, in an untenable position.

**Mr. Chairman:** Everything is untenable here. We are talking about a general debate on the budget. We are not discussing an individual's well-being, or the reasons he was dismissed. There are other means of doing this and I wish you would pursue those means. We will continue with general debate on the budget.

**Mr. Porter:** It was my understanding, and maybe wrongly so, that in the area of general debate, it was an opportunity for members of the House to bring up very general questions about the operations of particular departments.

In conforming with the ruling that you have just reaffirmed, I would like to say that there are other areas of the department that

are ongoing that do require expenditure of government dollars in the carrying out of those programs, that have given considerable question as to the ability of the department to manage the resources for which they have been set. Most recently, we have been involved in the whole controversy of the wolf poisoning program, a program which the minister apparently spoke at long length about last week. I have not yet read in detail the wolf management program that has been tabled by the minister, but I am to understand that it does reaffirm the government's position to go forward with the poisoning program aspect.

<sup>29</sup> In addition, I think that the whole question of how we arrived at a decision to poison the wolves in Yukon has to be questioned. I think that there has been a lot of controversy and also a lack of planning in respect of arriving at a decision. I believe it was on September 16th that we first received word from the government by way of a policy statement that they, in effect, had decided to enter what was called, at that time, "a one-time only poisoning program". Later on, the 10th of November, we heard further from the government by way of a motion to the effect that the government was prepared, where necessary throughout Yukon, to involve themselves in the poisoning program.

Throughout that debate, we have not yet been given evidence that there has been long-term planning made by the government with respect to this problem. I believe, in my general, cursory glance at the wolf management program, that there is a suggestion that the new direction the government will undertake would be one of looking at a long-term plan. That is something that I, myself, and many members of the public in Yukon are grateful for.

However, there is one specific area that I would like the government minister to give a response to, and that is the whole question of the bounty. We have heard a lot of support for the bounty throughout Yukon and there is a very serious question as to what the cost-effectiveness of the poisoning program versus the bounty program would be. I think it is a very relevant question to bring up at this particular point in general debate as both programs will cost the government and, ultimately, the taxpayer, a degree of dollars.

So, if I could at this point, I would like to put a question to the minister as to whether or not his department has carried out an analysis with respect to the two programs; and can the minister give us an indication as to the relative importance and also the cost-effectiveness of the two programs?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The wolf program that I introduced in the House last week, and gave a public press release on, was a program that my department has spent the last five to six weeks working on. Every aspect of wolf management was looked at, including the bounty system. The bounty system was rejected by my department and the biologists and technical people in it; they did not think it would be cost-effective.

The member across the floor is constantly saying I am not listening to the expertise that I have in my department. All I can say is that my department has given me that advice and I have acted on it. I do have a small question in my own mind of whether it might be beneficial to put a bounty system on in the territory and I will be having my department have another look at it. The advice that I have, to date, from my department's expertise, including the biologists, is that it would not be cost-effective.

<sup>30</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** I apologize to the member for butting in, but I am moved to ask this question. The minister states that in the last five or six weeks the department was looking at it. He told the advisory committee a few days before the announcement and gave the proposal as a statement of government policy to the advisory committee: why was the advisory committee process not used?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think the member should have been here for question period. He would have had my response to that question during question period. The advisory committee is just exactly that: an advisory committee to the government. It is not a committee that is set up to develop policy. Policy is developed by the government. The advisory committee is set up to give advice on that policy and also on other policies that the government should consider. As I said, it took us five to six weeks to develop this wolf

management policy. As soon as we had it completed, it was presented to the Wildlife Advisory Committee. The only reason it was a short time frame was because of the intense public pressure that we have to do something about the wolves in this territory. I can also state categorically that by far the largest majority of every member that was on the wildlife committee was in almost full agreement with the proposal that was put forward by my department.

**Mr. Porter:** However, I might add to the minister's concluding statements, with respect to the Wildlife Advisory Committee, that there was not a procedure at the committee to effectively put forward a formally recorded decision of that committee. I am informed that there was no secretary at the meeting, that there were no minutes kept of that particular meeting and there were no formal statements made by the committee in respect of whether or not they did favour the program, one way or another. The discussions I had with the members involved is that they did not feel that they were in a position to make a decision at that particular point; that they were simply brought in to look at the Wolf Poisoning Program and, at that short notice, give their opinion as to the effectiveness of that program.

In respect to the consequent program that has been announced, I would ask a question of the minister in respect of the program, where it deals with the Finlayson lake caribou herd. It has been stated, in that program, that the Finlayson lake caribou herd is feared to be on the decline, that there is an insufficient ratio of calves to cows in respect of that herd and wolf predation is suspected. Has the minister received any written commitment or any written notice from the trappers who do trap in the Ross River area, in respect of the Finlayson caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Perhaps there has been in my department. Before I deal with that, I would like to deal with the Wildlife Advisory Committee. The member across the floor says that they were not presented with enough information to make a decision. The Wildlife Advisory Committee is not set up to make decisions; the Wildlife Advisory Committee is set up to make recommendations or to comment on government policy. That is what they did. I was at that meeting; the member across the floor was not. I know what happened.

The biologists in my department did a study on the Finlayson caribou herd and their best information is that the wolf population is on the increase and the caribou population is on the decrease, and the problem is the wolf. The member is always saying that my department is not listening to the expertise that we have within it. I can assure the member that we are and that is why we are presently embarked on a wolf reduction program in the Finlayson caribou area.

**Mr. Porter:** I did not state that they were not given enough information. At the time, what I did speak about was the allocation of time for the members to address the information and give an informed opinion.

In regard to the Finlayson caribou herd, I have just received, this afternoon, prior to coming in the House, a copy of a letter that was sent to the minister from the Band Council of the Ross River Band, and it is to the effect that they have asked the government to not use poison in the area of Finlayson lake. They fear that it will affect other furbearing animals that will be trapped by the Ross River trappers. That is why I raised the question. In light of representations that have been brought forward by a sector of the Ross River populace, what is the minister's response to the continuation of a poisoning program in the Finlayson lake area?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would suggest that the member across the floor reads the presentation that I put to this House. I can assure him that it does not say in there anywhere that there will be poison used in the Finlayson caribou herd area. Incidentally, there seems to be a lot of concern by the trappers about our poison program because we are trying to reduce the wolf population. We give trapline permits out to these people to manage the fur and to harvest the fur on these traplines. I would suggest that the wolf is also a furbearing animal and is also part of the responsibility of the trappers to manage in their areas. Perhaps, if the trappers had trapped a lot more wolf instead of approximately 100 in the last

year, my department and the taxpayer would not have to come up with all this money in order to have a wolf-control program. I would suggest that the trappers also have some responsibility for the situation that we are in right now. I know that it is hard to trap wolves, as they are very smart animals, but I think it is an obligation of these trappers to also help manage the furbearers on their trapline.

**Mr. Porter:** I am going to add to the minister's remarks, in conclusion, that that is a very strong argument in favour of the bounty system. In effect, by levying a bounty, what you do is you create an incentive on the trappers' part to go after the wolf, although he is recognized as one of the most elusive creatures in the bush.

In correction to the minister's statement, with respect to the Finlayson area, he stated that no where in the Wolf Management Program does he speak of poison being used in that area. I would like to correct him in terms of that particular statement because, in the documents that I do have, in the management program for the Finlayson lake, in the caribou range, it is stated under "method", "The proposed program will involve aerial hunting, though this may be supplemented by controlled poisoning and dropping efforts".

I would just like to, again, put my question to the minister: based on the opposition to the Wolf Poisoning Program given from the trappers in that particular region who do trap in the Finlayson area and who depend on the wildlife resources, would it still be your intent to introduce a poisoning program, should you deem it necessary?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If the people of Ross River can assure me and my department that they can trap the wolves and reduce that population by the 30 wolves that we say we want to take out of that area — if they can assure me that they will trap them this winter — I will not put a program in there of any type.

**Mr. Porter:** Possibly, this situation can be met halfway with the minister's assurance that a bounty system will be introduced. Probably, an increase of the wolf take would result in that particular area.

In respect to the whole question of wolf poisoning, I would like to ask the minister — he may have addressed it in his Wolf Management Program — but I would like to ask him if it is the intent of his department's officials that when they do, indeed, poison a wolf, would they be taking that particularly pelt of that animal and giving it to the trapper who holds the particular concession in which the wolf was taken?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it would not be my intention to give the wolf pelts to the trapper; if my department has to go and trap or poison or kill wolves aerially, it is the position of my department that we should take the hides and we should get the money back out of it. If the trappers want to trap the wolves, they are free and willing to do so, and I would hope that they would trap the wolves because I think that is most important; but I should also say that traplines are given out for trappers to trap the fur on them and their recovery is through the sale of pelts.

What the member across the floor is suggesting now is that we should pay these trappers to manage the fur on their area and I do not agree with doing that. The incentive is there and that is the sale of the fur.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I just want to ask the member for Campbell if, perhaps, he would be prepared to give this side of the House a guarantee — because he seeks it very often from this side of the House — that, as the member for the Ross River area, which also includes the Finlayson caribou herd, which is obviously of concern to my colleague and the department as to whether or not they are going to continue to propagate as a caribou herd, as opposed to being decimated by the wolf population — I am wondering if the member opposite would be prepared to give a guarantee that would go on the record here that all 30 wolves that are required to be taken out of that area will be done over the course of the winter, if the Ross River Indian Band says that they will do it or the trappers in the area?

**Mr. Porter:** Continuing my questioning of the minister on the issue of aerial hunting, would the minister inform us as to whether

or not his department, under the Area Hunting Program, would be relying on fixed-wing aircraft or choppers, in terms of a vehicle to use?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am not involved in the aerial hunting. I am the person who sets the policy for the department. The department has the obligation to use the best means possible to hunt the wolves. If it requires helicopters, they will use helicopters. If it is fixed-wing, they will use fixed-wing.

**Mr. Lang:** On the question I asked earlier, I did not get a reply.

**Mr. Porter:** The next question I would like to deal with is the issue of the poisons that will be used in respect to the Wolf Management Program and I would like to wonder — and I ask this in a question form to the minister involved — why, despite the negative reaction, when all the material has been put out publicly about strychnine, it was chosen to be used in the Wolf Poisoning Program?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I said earlier, there is very little difference between strychnine and 10-80. Strychnine is a fast-acting poison, 10-80 is a slow acting one, and for all of the people who are worried about decimating the wolf population in the territory, we find that, in most instances, strychnine will probably be the best poison to use because we can count the wolves; they stay right at the bait. If we use 10-80, we will have no ideas of how many wolves have taken the bait and have subsequently died.

**Mr. Porter:** I think, if you talk to the experts in the area of the use of poisoning, they will tell you that there is a great deal of difference between the two poisons, in that strychnine causes a lot more suffering to the animal.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member stands up as if he is the only expert on poisoning. I wonder where the member got his information that allows him to stand and say that 10-80 is better than strychnine. I would like to know where he gets his information from.

**Mr. Porter:** I consult the experts in the field. In respect to the overall program, on the whole wolf hunting question, I would like to ask the minister what steps his department has undertaken and what steps does his department plan to undertake in respect to delivering a wolf education program in Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As the member is probably well aware, we had a Wolf-trapping Education Program here last week. We filmed that all on video tape and intend to use it. Incidentally, from talking to trappers that have taken the program, they are very happy with it and satisfied. We will be continuing that program with the use of video tape.

**Mr. Porter:** There has been some question raised as to whether or not four days, the time allotted for the department personnel who will be checking baits, is enough. Should the minister be given strong evidence that four days is not enough time to leave baits, will he ask the department to quicken their visits to the baits?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If the member is willing to vote a whole bunch of money, maybe we can look at them every day.

**Mr. Porter:** The member's intellectual powers have never given anybody in this House any hope for his mental growth. In terms of the overall department's responsibility for the management of game, there is another added responsibility that they have, and that is in respect to the whole area of trapping.

Earlier this fall, we were witness to a very unfortunate incident in which a young trapper ended up losing a probationary licence to a particular line. I would like, without going into a long debate on the question, as I am sure the Chair would not like that, to ask very pointedly of the minister whether or not it is his opinion that his department's decision in the affair was in total agreement with the portions of the land claims agreements that have been agreed to by his government?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all I must admit that I perhaps am not a mental giant. But you can all rest assured that I am just as mentally capable as any member across the floor, and perhaps a lot more than this one member that has raised the issue. As to the trapper involved, I think that I have answered all those questions in the past, and I am not prepared to enter another debate on it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Could we restrict this type of discussion to another area. I would rather like to think that we are a little more

mature in here and dealing with something as mature individuals. We will now continue.

**Mr. McDonald:** I just have a couple of questions. One has to do with the extent to which this department is taking responsibility for Agriculture. The minister, in his preface to the general debate, did mention the fact that there were some soil analysis done. I was wondering to what extent his department does handle agriculture and to what extent is it responsible for land use planning?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** In my opening remarks, I said that my department was instrumental in having the federal government bring in a pathologist, who is a soil specialist, to study soils in the territory, which is a function of the Renewable Resources department: that is the long and the short of it.

The agricultural land and the disposition of agricultural land is in the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs, because of the fact that the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs does have the expertise and the people to dispense land in the territory. My department deals with the investigation of soils and so on, which I announced.

**Mr. McDonald:** Could the minister just state if there are any other pursuits of any technical nature? He seems to be zeroing in on soil analysis, but I was wondering if there were any other pursuits of a technical nature which may be associated with agriculture, for which his department has responsibility?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Many individuals in my department do have expertise on certain areas of agriculture. I could not, at the present time, state any specific expertise that we would be bringing in to deal with agriculture, but, certainly, we do have a lot of expertise in the department and, where necessary, we will bring more in — especially in land use planning, all the soil has to be checked to see whether it is beneficial for agriculture or not and that is all the function of land use planning.

**Mr. McDonald:** I was just wondering, as a follow-up to what the minister has just stated, whether or not the land use planning that he anticipates will pre-date the selection of lands for agricultural purposes by individuals.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think that we have answered that at least a dozen times today. Up until the time the land use plans are done on any area, that will not prevent people applying for land. We are certainly not prepared to hold up the issuance of agricultural land while we are waiting for a land use plan. I think that that position has been made clear at least a half a dozen times today.

**Mr. McDonald:** Can the minister state, in that case, whether this policy is a co-operative venture with the federal government and, if not, how the minister can justify presenting its proposals — and I believe it is called *Land Use Act* — if it is the case, which it obviously is, that the federal government does maintain control over this land?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I submit to you that the question is completely out of order. We are not discussing that bill at this time.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think at this time that we will take a short break.

#### Recess

**Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order and we will continue with general debate on page 224, Department of Renewable Resources.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to ask the minister when he plans to transfer responsibilities for campgrounds to Tourism, where they belong?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all, it is not my decision to make and the member is only surmising where they belong.

**Mr. Porter:** Before we leave the area of campgrounds, I have a couple of questions in respect to that. Last summer I was made aware that in Johnsons Crossing there were a lot of problems experienced, particularly in the following: all the road hunters starting heading up the Canol and they would come down on Johnsons Crossing like a horde of wild men and pitch up camp at the beach adjacent to the river. There were some real serious problems because the family at Johnsons Crossing utilizes the river water, to a great extent, and were pumping thousands of gallons a

day because they also have, as a business side, a shower facility. One of the problems was that these people were taking no mind as to where they left their waste. At times, it was around the pump house and right in the water and, I believe, they made representations this fall to the department. I was wondering what kind of corrective action the department has embarked upon to alleviate the situation of having those hunters down by the river, and other tourists?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I was not aware that there was representation made to my department. I am fairly confident that, if there was, my department would look at it and make a wise judgement on it as to what we could do about it. I should state that it is highly unlikely that my department could go around to every stream, wherever someone has access to it, and put up privies and garbage disposals. I think it would probably be more a matter of enforcement than anything else. That is something that I will take under consideration and I will ask my department about it.

**Mr. Porter:** The place involved is not any river or stream. It is a place of business. It is a place where a family has resided since 1947, I believe. It is also a location in which there is a public campground. Various suggestions have been made, and one was to the effect of having a gate put up and having the key for the gate put in the hands of the proprietors of that particular area. They could then control access to the area adjacent to their property. It is just a suggestion that the minister should take into consideration as he examines the problem.

I think there is a lot of concern with respect to the usage of campgrounds. Early this summer, we had a bit of discussion regarding the whole idea of privatization of campgrounds. As I travelled along the Alaska highway throughout my riding, one of the things that I noticed was that there were an awful lot of tourists staying just beside the road. Wherever there was a convenient gravel pit, they pulled in. Invariably there was a lot of waste left along the Alaska highway. There was one time I counted 46 vehicles, between here and Watson Lake, of tourists who seemingly were camping for the night off the road. I was wondering if this is the problem that has been addressed and if so, what kinds of action will we be seeing taken by the government in the future to alleviate the problem of tourists staying anywhere in Yukon and dumping their wastes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think the member is aware that we have built campgrounds throughout the territory. It is a very comprehensive project and expensive to try to build these campgrounds that are what the people would desire to stay in. Unfortunately, if the tourists, or anyone else, decides to camp alongside the highway, other than patrolling the highway and giving them a ticket for parking, there is very little we can do about it. We try to make the campgrounds as nice as possible so that they will use them. Most of them do. When people are driving the highways as tourists and they become tired, they do not want to drive 10 or 15 or 20 miles to the next campsite so they will pull off the side of the road and park. That is not the responsibility of my department. There is very little I can do about that.

**Mr. Porter:** It would have to be a responsibility of the Department of Highways, because they are parked on the right of way. As far as Renewable Resources Department trying to enforce their parking on the right of way or not parking on the right of way, there is very little we can do about it.

**Mr. Porter:** In reading the Wildlife Management Plan, I was struck by one peculiar decision in respect to the wolf management group. My question is, in terms of the representation on that particular management group, why is it that two of the three members are from the enforcement side of the department as opposed to the biological side?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would like to correct the member; they are not two members from the enforcement side. One member is Mark Hoffman, who is the head of that department, and the other member is the moose biologist, Mr. Larson. So I am not sure, I do not think that there are two members from the enforcement side. I may be wrong there.

**Mr. Porter:** The information that I have here is that one is Doug Linklater, who is a special services officer.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** On a point of correction, he is right. The member claims that there are two members from the enforcement side, but this is not true. Mr. Hoffman is the head of that branch.

**Mr. Porter:** In enquiring about Mr. Hoffman's professional background, is it not true that he has come through the enforcement branch?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, and it is also true that Mr. Hoffman is also well aware of how to use poison. He has used it many times in the past, and so have the other conservation officers, and that is the reason why they are there; because they are well aware of how to use poison. This may not necessarily be true of a biologist.

**Mr. Porter:** The question still remains as to why we have two enforcement officers on the group management committee as opposed to only one biological one.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There is one enforcement officer, one biological officer, and the director of the department on the problem. The reason that Mr. Hoffman is on there is because he is the director of the department. He has nothing to do with enforcement.

**Mr. McDonald:** I just have a couple of brief questions. Last spring, the legislature was told by, I believe, the Public Accounts Committee, that a departmental reorganization was in the works. And that the ratio of urban to rural officers was to be increased in favour of the latter. I was wondering if the minister would give us an update on that reorganization and tell us whether or not any Whitehorse officers, for example, have been moved into the rural areas?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I was not aware of what was said last spring, but there was a reorganization in the department. The wildlife management and the conservation aspects were all put in the one Department of Wildlife Management and that is now headed by Mr. Hoffman. There were promotions within the department; there were transfers of people into some outlying areas, yes. There has been a shift away from most of the people being in Whitehorse, to the rural areas. That is the reason why, for example in Ross River, you will see two members instead of one; in Dawson City, there are two or three members instead of one. We are trying to spread these people out over the territory, and cover it from the rural areas rather than from Whitehorse.

**Mr. McDonald:** I was wondering whether the minister could tell me what his department considers to be the major "command centres", around the territory? Perhaps he could address the policy in a little more depth, a little more closely, for the filling of staff vacancies.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Maybe I am a little bit dull, but I do not understand the question there. The policy is as stated: we are trying to diversify into the outlying areas. Watson Lake, Ross River, Dawson City, Mayo and Haines Junction are examples of where we are trying to concentrate in the rural areas; and to cover the territory from those areas rather than from Whitehorse.

As far as the policy of hiring people, it is the same policy we have always had. We have, I think, three or four vacancies in the department right now.

**Mr. McDonald:** I did not ask specifically about hiring policies, but I thank the minister, anyway, for his information.

I would like to ask quite a specific question now — the previous question was a little bit of a preparation for this one: why exactly was a vacancy in Mayo created to fill a vacancy in Dawson?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am not prepared to enter into that debate, again, either; we have had it once before in this House.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to continue that particular line of questioning to enquire as to what is the government's policy in respect of transfers of employees?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The government's policy, in regard to transfer of employees, within my department, is to put the people where they will serve the department best. That is the long and the short of it. Taking into consideration in all of these aspects is the welfare of the person involved, and that is given a great deal of consideration before any decision is made.

**Mr. Porter:** I have been told that, in one particular incident, a group of the conservation officers was brought together in a room and the transfers of the individuals was done by taking a sheet of



paper and simply handing it to the members affected, and that sheet of paper invariably told them to where they were to be transferred. Did this, in fact, happen and, if it did, would he give us the undertaking that it will not in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The transfers were made before I assumed the responsibility for the department so I am not sure exactly what happened. If that, in fact, did happen, I can assure the member that it will not happen in the future.

**Mr. Penikett:** Unless Mr. Porter wanted to pursue this angle, I want to change the subject. I wanted to pursue a matter which the minister might feel more at home with and that is cabins. The other day the minister, in one of his capacities as the Minister of the Department of Government Services, answered some questions that I put to him in his other capacity as minister responsible for renewable resources. So that we can clarify the situation firmly, I want to ask a couple of follow-up questions to the answers that the minister did not give me on November 24.

On November 15, 1982, following my question, I asked also about cabins at Stirling lake and in my question misspelled the lake and, in fact, it should have been Stirlin lake. I am curious as to whether the minister overlooked that or, because I had misspelled the lake, they were not able to answer the question?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I gave the member the answer when I tabled it previously. As far as a cabin at Stirlin or Stirling lake, I am not aware of it. I have Granite, Clear lake and Rose lake and if there is a cabin at Stirling or Stirlin lake I am not aware of it.

**Mr. Penikett:** That is fine. That answers questions a) and b). In his answer to question c), I am curious about the language and if the minister could explain a little bit what is meant by this: "As it is understood, the purpose of these cabins was to allow for their use as shelter for wildlife and patrol purposes." What does the minister mean by "as it is understood"? Is that how the use evolved in time or was there some other use before that? What is meant by the answer, "as it is understood"?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I think the members are well aware, those cabins were built on those lakes long before we were elected to this government. They were commissioned by the Commissioner back in the very early 1970s, or even earlier. They were built for the Department of Renewable Resources so they would not have to travel back and forth to town and utilize aircraft, but rather, they could stay in the cabins and conduct their studies, or whatever they were doing, from that area.

**Mr. Penikett:** In the next answer, the minister indicated that since they are now under the control of the Department of Government Services, "the use of these cabins is authorized by the minister or deputy minister of Government Services". I am curious as to what the situation was before, and if it is for wildlife patrol purposes presumably there was no authorization necessary because it was automatic for the wildlife patrol purposes. I wanted to ask, because this question was not answered: were these cabins used for any other purposes and who authorized the uses for other purposes other than wildlife patrol purposes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Up until the cabins were turned over to the Department of Government Services, there was very little control over them, which was the reason there were so many complaints about them. Anyone could use the cabins; as a matter of fact, they were being used as private hunting camps by a lot of people. They thought that the taxpayer should look after these buildings and they should be able to utilize them whenever they wanted to. That is the reason they were transferred out of Renewable Resources; to take that pressure away from them, and give them to Government Services to be managed as any other government building is managed. If any government department needs to utilize those buildings, they apply to Government Services for the right to use them. They are not kept there as tourist cabins for anyone who wants to use them.

**Mr. Penikett:** I appreciate the minister's answer. He indicated in his answer that there had been complaints about their use and he also indicated that they had been used as private hunting cabins. Also, in the written answer on November 24th, he indicated that no records were kept by the Department of Renewable Resources on their use. Is he satisfied in his own mind that when he refers to

private hunting cabins that he is talking about private citizens who happen to come upon these cabins and occupy them temporarily for this purpose, or were there cases when officials of this government were using them for that purpose? By officials, I mean the entire complement of people in the government.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The reason I said "use of private hunting cabins" is that I think what was happening was that there were certain people who could afford to hire a plane, or whatever they wanted, and knew that the cabins were there; they would just fly out to that lake and use it just as if it belonged to them. That was the reason why we transferred them out of Renewable Resources into Government Services where they could be controlled as any other government asset is. It is not the taxpayers' responsibility to maintain these cabins for people's private use. I suppose, yes, government employees were also using them, as private citizens.

**Mr. Penikett:** I thank the minister again for his answer. Could I just ask him one last question on this subject? The minister's written answer indicated that no records were kept by Renewable Resources of this use. I accept his explanation that there were individuals who may have been in this government, as well as outside the government, who had access to the lakes and who may have been using them as private hunting cabins. Could I ask the minister this: even though no records were kept, to his knowledge as minister, was any of this use of these properties as private hunting locations authorized by anyone at a ministerial or deputy ministerial level?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I believe the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs actually did, on one occasion at least; he could tell you that, I could not tell you. If you are asking me whether I authorized any, no.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would ask the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs if he might care to indicate to the House under what circumstances the use of this cabin, as a private hunting cabin, was authorized by the minister, if he wishes to.

Let me just ask a couple of other general questions to the Minister of Renewable Resources, though. I understand the use of the cabins for shelter for wildlife patrol purposes. Even though they are in Government Services, the patrol purposes will continue to be a function of the minister in his capacity as Minister of Renewable Resources. Does he have any other plans for these properties, or any other projected use for them, other than that stated in his previous answer?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not at this time, but I would welcome proposals from anyone who is interested in purchasing some of those assets from the government, because we feel that, in this day and age, we do not have that demand on those cabins. I should also tell the members that they are blowing it all out of proportion; they are not big, fancy hunting lodges, or whatever. They are just patrol cabins, except for Rose lake, which was purchased because of taking over that hunting area. I would certainly be amenable to proposals from private individuals or companies, if they were interested in purchasing those assets.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Just to answer the leader of the official opposition in respect to previous use: the procedure was very clear. The cabins were there; if anybody wanted to utilize them, they had to contact a designated individual within the Department of Renewable Resources and then they would get the key and the authorization to go in. There are a lot of people, for example in the Rose lake area, who are going out skidooing or whatever, and it was thought that if we knew who was there, at least we would know that the cabin was being kept up, as opposed to people just coming upon it and perhaps misusing the property, thinking that they were not permitted to use it.

**Mr. Penikett:** I thank the minister for his answer. He indicated that they had to contact the designated individual, and then they were authorized to go in, which indicates a somewhat more formal procedure than I had understood from the answer. Could the minister, as a ballpark figure, indicate to the House, during the times they were under his care, how many authorizations were given, approximately?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It was brought to my attention at one time that there were people who would like to use the cabin. They were

private citizens. I enquired into it and said, "Look, there has to be a general policy." I decided that they were local residents who were going out into that area and as long as they contacted the individual within the department, then they could utilize the facilities. I do not think that they were utilized that much, actually, but you would have to check on that.

**Mr. Penikett:** Thank you, so we know that it was used one time for sure. Now, let me go back to the Minister of Renewable Resources. In respect to the use of these cabins for wildlife patrols, given that they have to fly in to get to them, that would indicate to me that they are fairly infrequent, in terms of the patrol use of them, given the cost of aircraft. Could the minister give me some kind of ballpark figure on how often they might be used, each one once or twice a year, or perhaps more than that?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would suggest that they are used now even less frequently than that. They might be used once or twice a year, but I doubt it.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would assume then that the minister, given his previous statement, would indicate now that they are under the care of Government Services, that it is keeping some kind of a record of visitations, and the number of people who use and occupy those cabins. Would those records though, let me ask the minister in both his capacities, include the uses by the officials of the Renewable Resources department who are going there in their work?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we would have a record of every use, because the cabins now have locks on the doors, and there would have to be an application to Government Services in order to acquire the use of the buildings.

I should also like to add that in regard to the Rose lake cabin, we have entered into a contract with one individual. We allow him to utilize one of the buildings, and in return for that we have his services to look after the rest of the building for us.

**Mr. Porter:** During the course of this afternoon, the last couple of months and even this last year, we have heard of numerous problems in this department. We have heard of trapping problems, wolf problems, cabin problems, and, most importantly, human problems.

"In summation, I would like to state that it is very clear that there are some deep, serious problems within the department and that, as legislators, we have a responsibility to take corrective action. It has been suggested by members of the public that the best possible method to deal with overall problems within a department of government is the process of a public enquiry. That suggestion has been put to the minister and it has been rejected by this particular minister. I would like to suggest that he take another look.

I believe that the whole question of the personalities of the minister and myself is miniscule in terms of the management and well-being of the Yukon's resources, particularly the wildlife resources. The differences of opinion that we may have should come secondary to the whole question of how we manage our resources in the Yukon. That is the issue that we should concentrate on, and I think that it is an issue that most people in the Yukon are very concerned about.

During the course of the fall, I have had a lot of public response to the issues that have been raised and, I think, generally, wildlife is something that people feel very seriously about, in respect to how they are managed. If the minister continues further rejection of the idea of a public enquiry, I would like to ask of him — for no reason to entrap or ridicule him — for the purposes of obtaining information, what other process does he envision could be brought into effect to address these problems within the department and to address problems within the other sphere of the department as it relates to the wildlife and to the public. I, seriously, would like to know.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I rejected the public enquiry because I do not believe a public enquiry is necessary for my department. As the member is well aware, I assumed responsibility for this department only a few short months ago. I also have a new deputy minister. There are structural changes being made in the department and all of the areas of problems are being addressed. I do not believe it is beneficial, or necessary, for a public enquiry. I would suggest to the member that, perhaps, if he would wait a few more months he

would probably see a significant change in that department.

#### *On Administration*

*Administration in the amount of \$526,000 agreed to*

#### *45 On Resource Planning and Management*

**Mr. Porter:** Last year, during the sitting of the Select Committee, as it addressed this particular department, one of the key issues of discussion was the whole area of the gathering of the baseline data on the wildlife's resources. It was the position of the then deputy minister that there was insufficient data on Yukon's wildlife resource. Does that continue to be so? If it does, how does he measure the current success rate of the department? In other words, are they further down the line of achieving a sound baseline data, as to the existence of the numbers of the wildlife in Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We are making significant advances. If the member is not aware, it is very costly to do these things. We do a limited amount each year. For example, to do a study on any game could run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, or even millions of dollars, in order to get the necessary information. For example, the Yukon River Basin Study that we are doing is \$500,000. All it does is give us limited information in a limited area of the territory. In order to get all the wildlife information that we need to be completely knowledgeable about the territory will take us a good many years and many, many millions of dollars. We have to operate with the information we have available now and we do the best job that we can with the information.

#### *On Resource Management Administration*

*Resource Management Administration in the amount of \$223,000 agreed to*

#### *On Inventory and Planning*

**Mr. Porter:** Could the minister explain why there was, in the area of resource administration, an increase and why we see a decrease in this particular area of inventory and planning?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The decrease arises from salary reductions, O&M reduction of \$12,000, and we transferred the Agricultural Development Council funds to Municipal and Community Affairs, and we transferred into administration some of the administration aspects of the Policy and Administration Branch.

*46 Inventory and Planning in the amount of \$131,000 agreed to*

#### *On Evaluation and Assessment*

**Mr. Porter:** Maybe we could have an explanation here, again, as to the increase in that particular department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The \$67,000 in this department is for: salaries and expenses for the land use specialists and the habitat specialists; departmental representation on various land use related committees, such as the Yukon River Basin, or whatever else we are in joint agreement with the federal government on; for development of wildlife habitat programs — we are looking, also, at control burns in one area — and also the study of critical habitat of some of the sheep.

**Mr. Porter:** In this particular program, could the minister tell us which of those activities are new to the program, over and above last year, to more or less correlate the percentage of expenditure increase?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am not exactly sure, but I believe it is the land use specialists who were an addition to this department. I probably have the information in here somewhere, but it is probably going to take me quite a while to sort through it and find it.

*Evaluation and Assessment, in the amount of \$67,000, agreed to*

#### *On Small Game Management*

**Mr. Porter:** We show no expenditure last year in this particular area. Is that \$958,000 a combination of the two?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes.

**Mr. Porter:** I will then address my question in conjunction with the two. Why is it the department breaks down the two management functions as to big game and small game management?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is part of the reorganization that is done within the department. We now have biologists and planners associated with specific small game and another biologist who is the



head of big game and the planning in that area. This is part of the departmental reorganization, to have people specifically allocated to certain types of game.

**Mr. Porter:** How is the distinction made as to whether one fits into big game or small game?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think the small game, as all members are aware, is usually the furbearers. There is only one possible change and that would be the wolf who, as well as being a furbearer, is also a big game trophy.

**Mr. Porter:** And the wolverine would fit into that as well. In respect to big game management allocation of dollars, are the dollars also expended on the big game outfitting industry?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, the big game portion is dealing with the big game and the management of big game such as moose, caribou, grizzly bear and all the rest of it. Small game are the furbearers.

*Small Game Management in the amount of \$233,000 agreed to*

#### *On Big Game Management*

**Mr. Porter:** Are the expenditures of both of these programs related to the entire management of the animals right from the data collection to the studies and also to the licences or is licencing and all the other administrative functions separated and put into administration?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The licencing is not a function of each of these. It is an administrative function. The big game management deals with the complete personnel costs as well as the technicians involved and their travel, telephone and vehicle maintenance. All of that is charged against big game management or small game management, whatever.

*Big Game Management in the amount of \$536,000 agreed to*

#### *On Parks and Outdoor Recreation*

**Mr. Porter:** I wonder if we could have an explanation as to the increase in this particular area?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think everyone is well aware that we are trying to develop our parks throughout the territory. In order to get a good system in the territory, it takes more money. If we are going to concentrate and try to make a system of campgrounds and territorial parks that are beneficial to the tourist industry, we have to expend a little more money. I would suggest that a \$12,000 increase over one year is a very small amount.

**Mr. Porter:** Is the \$12,000 increase that is reflected a result of the development of the Carcross campground area?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, this department deals with all of the planning for all of the parks and campgrounds that we have in the territory. The Carcross park is just one of the many that we are looking at.

*Parks and outdoor recreation in the amount of \$141,000 agreed to*

*Resource Planning and Management in the amount of \$1,331,000 agreed to*

#### *On Wildlife and Park Services*

**Mr. Porter:** I was wondering, I do not see any person-years allocated for 1982-83 under the area of renewable resources. Does it show an indication from the previous year? Does that mean that the person-years have not changed at all?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know what area you are talking about.

**Mr. Porter:** The allocation of person-years. Has there been any change in this particular area of the department? Resource planning and management.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am not sure. There has not been any new person-years in my department. If there has been anything, it has been a reduction. But with the amalgamation and reorganization, it is pretty hard to get a comparison; that is why it is not there.

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now carry on with wildlife and park services, page 232. Any general debate?

**Mr. Penikett:** A very general question: The park services has been going in one form or another, for about eight years now. I would be curious to know if they have any parks as yet.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If we have any parks? Most of our campgrounds are territorial parks. For example, this year, a great amount of work was done on Million Dollar Falls. The campgrounds themselves are only part of these territorial parks. They are put in very nice areas, for example, we just built one at Marsh Lake. We are trying to build not just a campground *per se*, but something that the people can enjoy. There are other areas of interest that they can enjoy as well as just camp.

**Mr. Penikett:** I understand that the department has a longer term interest in park development, and presumably those questions of land transfers are involved. We did, however, some years ago, consider a bill called the *Parks Ordinance*, I think somewhere around 1979. We passed it. Can the minister indicate what is happening to that? I ask the question because when we talk about park services, it implies to many ordinary citizens that we have some kind of parks system here, when really all we have at this point is a campground system.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is true. Until we can convince the federal government that they should transfer, in a block land transfer, some of these areas such as Kusawa or Ethel Lake or whatever, we are not going to get into the large territorial park aspect that we would like to get into. Another one that we would like for a territorial park is Herschel Island. Until the federal government will agree to transfer these areas in a block land transfer, we will not be able to get into large territorial parks.

**Mr. Porter:** Has the department gone through the process of identifying and notating, in map form, those geographical areas which they would like to see created as territorial parks? If it has, could you give us a number?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we do have some of them identified. A couple that I mentioned were Kusawa and Ethel Lake. There are others such as Fort Selkirk and Herschel Island. I do not have the number, but there are significant areas in the territory that we want to turn into territorial parks. In fact, one of them that we identified a few years ago is the Firth River, which is an area now that is being considered for a national park.

**Mr. Porter:** Is it still the government's intention to pursue the creation of an international park, in respect to Alaska, to commemorate the gold rush activities that occurred here?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is one of the areas that we have been pursuing for a few years. When it is developed to the stage where the federal government will transfer some of these lands over to us, yes, we would be prepared to look at it.

One concern has been the corridor concept through the territory; to have the Yukon River declared as part of this International Gold Rush Park. I think we have overcome that by picking specific areas that we want to protect, such as Fort Selkirk or Hootalinqua. I think we will probably be progressing with this International Gold Rush Park aspect.

**Mr. Porter:** In the discussion on the whole issue of creating parks and the legislation that would eventually be brought into create those parks, has there been any discussion in respect to creating and setting aside wild and scenic rivers and giving those rivers some degree of protection under parks legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, in fact we are working with the federal government right at this time.

50

#### *On Administration*

**Mr. Porter:** I would like an explanation of the increase.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There is no increase or transfer of people into it. It is just a general operations and maintenance increase in this department. \$140,000 of this is for salaries and the balance is for O&M.

*Administration in the amount of \$166,000 agreed to*  
*On Conservation Officer Services*

**Mr. Porter:** In this particular area, something unusual we see is quite a substantial decrease in the allocation of funds. I am sure that they are not all related to transfer. Can the minister explain?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** You are going to find, as you go through this whole budget, significant changes because of the reorganization of this department. I can tell you what it is composed of. This section has 13 permanent staff, including the chief conservation

officer and his regional conservation officers. They have headquarters in Dawson City, Ross River, Haines Junction, Watson Lake and Mayo. Through the devolution of these conservation officers' services, we have been able to make some reductions in the cost in Whitehorse. That and some of the transfers that were made interdepartmentally have reduced this. There is also the fact that we are on the nine-day fortnight.

**Mr. Porter:** If the minister is not absolutely clear in terms of his answer, I wonder if he would undertake to give me a written indication as to that reduction in that particular program area? By and large, when a decrease of this magnitude is shown, it suggests a certain degree of loss of service to the public. I am wondering if the minister would agree to give a written answer to more or less fill out what he has already said?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There is not a loss to the public. We devolved this responsibility to the outlying areas in order to give the public better service. If the member wants, I can run the whole budget and tell him exactly what it is allocated to. There is \$370,000 for permanent staff, \$155,000 for casual staff, \$83,000 for travel, \$34,000 for telephone and communication, \$76,000 for rental of equipment, \$18,000 for utilities, materials and supplies, and \$62,000 for miscellaneous such as fuel and field vehicles and preventative maintenance.

**Mr. Porter:** I did not necessarily want the listing of items, nor did I suggest that a loss of service to the public had taken place. I simply made the statement that, in areas where money has increased, generally it means a loss of service. I am simply wanting an answer from the minister as to where the discrepancy is? Where has the cutback been made, if at all? Has it been relatively a transfer or, simply, have they not hired people?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think if the member recognizes what I said, we are on a the nine-day fortnight, which is a significant reduction when you have 35 people on staff.

**Mr. Porter:** If he does not want to write me a letter, that is fine with me. I will settle for the oral answer.

*Conservation Officer Services in the amount of \$881,000 agreed to*

#### *On Parks Operations*

**Mr. Porter:** Is the decrease strictly an O&M measure?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes.

*Parks Operations in the amount of \$372,000 agreed to*

#### *On Special Services*

**Mr. Porter:** Aside from catching sheep hunters in sheep parks, what is involved in this particular department? What is the main function of this department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The special services of this line item cover our special investigations in conjunction with the federal government; if they, for example, considered that someone was poaching sheep, they would investigate. That is what this department does. It does those special investigations. This man is responsible for those special investigations.

**Mr. Porter:** In the chain of command, does the special services person answer directly to the director of enforcement?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This man answers to the director of the department.

*Special Services in the amount of \$61,000 agreed to*

#### *On Information and Education*

**Mr. Porter:** Aside from the trapper education program that is conducted in Yukon on, usually, an annual basis, what else is performed in this expenditure area?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It does all of the trapper education programs, the hunter safety program and others like that; the programs in the schools. The function of this department is to do all of that education; all the education that is done by the Department of Renewable Resources is done through this line item.

*Information and Education, in the amount of \$50,000, agreed to*

**Mr. Byblow:** Before we clear this entire item out, I have just a couple of short questions on parks or campgrounds. Firstly, is it the intention to raise the fees of campgrounds in the coming year, and, secondly, could the minister indicate a little more information surrounding his earlier indication that he intends to close some campgrounds?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There has not been a decision made of whether we are going to raise campground fees or not. While we are looking at the whole aspect of campground fee collection, we will also consider that.

As far as closing campgrounds, yes, there are some campgrounds that we are going to have to close. The reason we build these big, territorial, park-type campgrounds is to give the travelling public the type of facility that we would like to have them have. That leaves us a surplus some of the smaller ones that are in old gravel pits, and things like that, which are uneconomical to maintain and are not beneficial to us. So, some of those we are addressing for closure.

**Mr. Byblow:** Of the 60 campgrounds in the territory now, how many does the minister anticipate to operate next year?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I could not give the member that statistic right now, because there are some campgrounds we are considering to close. I would suggest that we are probably looking at closure of at least six or eight, or maybe even more of them. They are just little ones that, in some cases, are not even being utilized today. We have them on our list of campgrounds, but we do not want to maintain them because they are hardly utilized. They are not beneficial for us to utilize because all they are doing, really, is taking the campers away from the larger ones, which we would sooner have them in, and it is just an added cost to us.

**Mr. Byblow:** In the case of every campground in the territory, is there a designated person or agency — that is, highways, perhaps — in charge of a campground for the servicing and clean-up of refuse?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, the agency is the Department of Renewable Resources. We have people who have these campgrounds assigned to them. We put them out on a contract basis. Most of them are casual employees on a contract basis. That is why you see the twelve casual person-years there. They are the campground maintenance people who work in campground maintenance in the department.

**Mr. Byblow:** So the minister is saying that if I get complaints about refuse not being picked up in certain campgrounds or vandalism having taken place and not being attended to for months — in other words, the campground is just not being kept up — the responsibility is this branch's?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, the responsibility is this branch's, unless you are talking about the pull-overs that are along the highways around the communities. That is the department of highway's responsibility.

*Wildlife and Parks Services in the amount of \$1,530,000 agreed to*

#### *On Subsidiary Agreement*

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now move to subsidiary agreement, on page 236-237, but before we have general debate on that, I would suggest that we recess until 7:30 p.m. this evening.

#### *Recess*

**Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like an explanation as to what this program is all about and, during the course of the explanation, a justification for the increase over last year's expenditure.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Most of the studies that are done by this department are done under the renewable resources subsidiary agreement. It is a major part of the funding of the Department of Renewable Resources. This is the last year of it and it is only five-cent dollars for us. Ninety-five percent is recoverable and it has been a very beneficial program for us in the last four years. As I said, this is the last year of it and if we can renegotiate a new agreement, we will try to carry the funding on. The money is used for various studies that we do in the wildlife areas.

*Subsidiary Agreement in the amount of \$744,000 agreed to*

#### *On Resource Corps*

**Mr. Porter:** This particular program, as I understand it, was

transferred from the Department of Education. Obviously there has been some drastic reductions to what is entailed in this program — from \$684,000 to \$230,000. Can we have an explanation?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is the same as the subsidiary agreement. It was an agreement signed with the federal government and it expires on March 31. That is the reason why the figures that you see have dropped from 1981-82 to 1982-83. We are winding-up the project. All that is left of that project are the conservation buildings, at the present time, and the cleaning up of a couple of others, such as the Carmacks swimming pool. Various projects were funded around the territory under this agreement.

*Resource Corps in the amount of \$230,000 agreed to*

#### *On Yukon River Basin Studies*

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The Yukon River basin study is also fully recoverable. It is federal government money that we use in conjunction with the federal government on the Yukon River basin study.

<sup>03</sup> It funds various projects, such as the moose study that we are doing at the present time, water fowl in the Nisutlin Delta, fur-bearing inventory, and a stream habitat inventory in the Atlin and Stewart area. Basically, it is a project designed to assist the federal government in its Yukon river basin study.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to ask the minister what the overall intent of the program is designed for. Is it designed to get an inventory or a cataloguing of all the resources in a particular management area?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It is basically for the benefit of the federal government, although we acquire a great deal of knowledge from it. It is for the benefit of the federal government to do a complete study of the Yukon River basin — look at all the inventory of all the resources that are within the Yukon river basin.

**Mr. Porter:** In the carrying out of the activities that are contained in the Yukon River basin study agreements, there obviously is a need to hire, at the local level, people to assist in the overall study process. I wonder if you could tell us if there have been any foreign people, other than Canadian people, hired to work on this particular project?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not to the best of my knowledge; at least not by this government. There may have been some special expertise that was required, but I am not aware of any. Also, I might add that, such as in the moose survey, we contract to a local business, actually, that does most of the study.

<sup>04</sup>

*Yukon River Basin Studies in the amount of \$456,000 agreed to*

#### *On Revenue and Recoveries*

*Revenue and Recoveries in the amount of a recovery of \$403,000 agreed to*

*Department of Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,817,000 agreed to*

#### **On Yukon Housing Corporation**

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have only a couple of comments in respect to this particular vote. You will note the net vote has been reduced \$124,000 from the level spent in the last financial year, and the reason for the reduction is the impact of the nine-day fortnight, the reduction of expenditures required on maintenance, increase in revenues to the corporation, which is the result of an increase in the rental rates charged to tenants — a direct reflection of market trends.

<sup>05</sup> Further to that, we have had staff tenants become responsible for paying the costs of utilities on their units. Also, there is an increase from a concerted effort to enforce the energy quota system and to actively pursue and collect overdue accounts for those tenants who abuse the quota system. I should point out that we will be continuing normal maintenance tasks over the course of the year, and also, there was an announcement that a certain amount of

retrofitting will take place over the course of the winter months on our housing units throughout the territory.

There are other points that may be of interest to members. Presently, under the employee buy-back scheme, we have seven homes; I believe it is four in Whitehorse, three outside of Whitehorse. Also, we have just put out tenders for a four-plex senior citizen home in the Dawson City area, which is a continuation of our program to gradually put into place senior citizen homes in the rural communities. We started with Watson Lake, went to Mayo, and now we are actually out tendering for the purposes of going into construction in the spring on a senior citizen residence in Dawson City. I think that pretty well covers it, other than the fact that perhaps I could give a basic run-down of the housing programs that we are responsible for.

One is low rental family housing. Two is rental purchase housing, low rental apartments, senior citizens housing, rent supplement, rural and native housing, staff housing and a government employee housing plan.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** If the minister answers my simple questions very simply, we will be on to the next item very quickly.

I am interested, first of all, in the departmental objective on page 259. As I read the objective, I agree with it. It is a good objective, and I would ask the minister if that is the objective of the corporation as well as being the departmental objective, in the governmental sense?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think it is a fair statement. We believe that all residents should have access to an adequate standard of housing. I think also that one area that we do encourage is home ownership and I think that that is probably why it is so fortunate that I am the minister of municipal affairs as well as housing, because the two go hand-in-hand. Also, it is to improve the quality of services and amenities relating to the housing that we do provide throughout the Yukon. I think it is a fair statement that, overall, we are doing that. In the past years we have done some major overhauling of our units, and some major energy efficient programs have been launched as well.

<sup>06</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** Last week, the minister tabled the last available annual report, and it is for 1980-81. I would like to ask a general question about the timing of information. Is the 1981-82 information not available now, and what is the reason for the substantial delay in information?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I think you will find that I included it in the Auditor General's report.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The last available tabled information about the objective of the corporation in the annual report is substantially different from the departmental objective on page 259. Can the minister assure us that the departmental objective is in fact the objective of the corporation?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I do not have the document that the member is referring to so I would not want to give a firm yes or no. But I suspect there would be great deal of similarity.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I can inform the minister that the objective in the annual report tabled last week is as follows, and I quote: "The objective of the corporation is the development, maintenance and management of home ownership and rental housing programs and the administration of the Government of Yukon Territory staff accommodation". It is a simple and clear objective, but the departmental objective is far more wide-ranging, and defensible, from my way of thinking, in that it talks about an adequate standard of accommodation for all residents. That is a substantial difference in objective and I am interested in which one is the present objective of the department?

<sup>07</sup> **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I could probably say "whichever one he likes best", but it seems to me from what I have said, going further into it, that where they are in social housing, and that type of thing, if one cannot afford to provide their own housing and are in very difficult straits, then we try to provide housing for them, at least for a brief period — as brief as possible, as far as we are concerned, because we feel that they are better off in the work-force and providing their own housing. And, in deference to the taxpayer, I think that is a very good policy. As far as I am concerned, we are playing with semantics. If the member wants to continue, that is

fine.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would disagree; it is not semantics at all, it is a very major difference in objective, and if the minister answers that whichever one I prefer will be the departmental objective, I would be pleased to say that the one on page 259 is the one I prefer, and I will expect in the next annual report of the corporation to see it re-printed there. I fully intend to measure the success of the program against that objective.

Nevertheless, I asked in Question Period about energy quotas and retrofitting for accommodation in my riding. I would ask, in a general sense, if the information is available or is it going to become available soon.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** The fuel and power quota was brought into effect July 1st, 1980, and it has to do with all community housing programs. The idea of the quota system was that the year would be broken down into four quarters, with each quarter fuel-year and power-year starting on July 1st. This was largely done because the summer months are low consumption months and it would allow some of the tenants to get used to the system before the winter set in and there was the consequence of higher utilization of power and fuel. The quotas were largely based on actual consumption of a particular house, as well as for the community, and the quotas were individually assigned and, from our perspective, generous enough to allow for any severe weather condition or household use.

∞ The fuel and the power usage would be totaled and if one was over the total quota allocated from July 1st, a letter would be sent to the tenant advising him or her of that, and then at the end of the next quarter if they were still over and had not tried to conserve they would have to pay the excess amount of money. The basic principle behind this was unless people knew they had to pay something for the energy they were using they would continue to abuse the services that were being provided.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** It answers the energy quota question. I was asking about retrofitting possibilities, especially in my riding. I would like to elaborate on the question, not in the partisan way, because I want to say that philosophically we are in agreement on incentives to save wasted dollars on energy, and we all know if a person is not actually paying for oil or electricity, there is no incentive to conserve, and abuse does in fact occur. I am simply trying to elaborate, and assist and inform myself of the programs.

Are there any programs being contemplated allowing some residents to install wood heat, extra insulation, or federally-funded programs along those lines?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have to apologize to the member; I had the information the other day. I have misplaced the information provided to me by the department, so I am going on memory now. It is my understanding that we are eligible for the CHIP program and some of the retrofitting programs that the federal government has provided. Further to that, in the programs on employment over the course of the coming winter, there will be some money made available to the Yukon Housing Corporation for the purposes of energy conservation measures. I am not totally sure in respect to the installation of wood stoves whether we are eligible, but I will bring that information back to you.

∞ **Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to ask about Greenwood House. I have asked in the past and I will simply elaborate on the question. I have spoken to residents there who inform me that at the building stage of the facility there were discussions about the planned use of the bishop's residence which, as the minister knows, is attached to the new building and is unused at the present time. It was going to be social space or space for the residents to sit in and spend time in. There was a later proposal about storage space. The storage facilities in the building are on the scanty side, according to some residents. I ask about the current planning for the building.

A number of people, in recent months, asked me about the possibility of office space for voluntary agencies for seniors in the building. An example is the Meals on Wheels kind of concept and exchange services among seniors and a visiting nurse. Those kinds of programs could be accommodated out of that building or that space. I asked the question in Question Period and I would ask if the minister is able to elaborate or make a progress statement now.

As a second question, I would ask about the waiting list, or the

projected waiting list, for this kind of accommodation for senior citizens in Whitehorse. I am informed that it is excellent accommodation. It is enjoyed by the residents because of the location, the price and the convenient size of the particular units. I know it is full. Is there a waiting list and a planned expansion of this program in the future?

∞ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I do not have the actual list of people who are waiting to get into that particular residence or any other senior citizen residence. I am sure the member, when he does talk to some of his constituents in that area, refers back to the fact that Mr. Lang was the minister when the decision was made to go ahead and build it. I just wanted to remind you so that the next time you have a conversation you could bring that up. As far as the bishop's house is concerned, no firm decision has been made in respect to that particular part of the building. We will be looking at it over the course of the budgeting process and if the decision is to go ahead with it, it will be tabled and discussed in the House. I recognize there are a number of plans for that particular side of the building and I am sure, over the course of the year, something will be done. It should be pointed out that the initial renovation design was being done by an architect from Public Works, and it was to be discussed with the tenants. I recognize that everyone has an idea about how that part of the building should be utilized. Further to that, once all that has been discussed and decisions made, then a decision will be made about the budget.

I guess that roughly covers it. I think I have answered your question. I recognize that there is some further need, perhaps down the road, for another senior citizen home, but it will be another few years before one is brought into place. I think it is safe to say that we are providing, in the rural communities throughout the territory, to also put up necessary accommodation for the senior citizens, which is a high priority of this side of the House. I am pleased to see it is on that side of the House as well.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to inform the minister that I circulate all of the questions and answers among the residents and they are most interested in the statements that you make. I am interested in the waiting lists and I would ask if the minister would undertake to, at a later time, provide a statement of the waiting list — perhaps quarterly or every six months, or so, over the last 18 months. I will simply inform the minister that I will be asking this question probably every session until it is renovated, and the waiting list problem is entirely ended, if it ever is.

∞ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I am very pleased to hear the member give me information, and that he was circulating the necessary information to the tenants of Greenwood Place, and perhaps other residents throughout his riding. I will answer fully the questions about Greenwood Place so that everyone knows who is responsible for the building and, of course, who is responsible for the continuing operation and maintenance of that particular facility, as well, which we are very pleased to have under our responsibility, and also, at the same time, provide such a very needed service to our community.

In respect to a list, I am not going to bring the names of people forward; I will bring the numbers, and as he has put me on alert, I will put it into my opening statements the next time we have a budget.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chairman:** General debate, under the Yukon Housing Corporation? Though we cleared the amount, we should go to the supplementary information on page 262 and 264. Are there any questions on the supplementary information?

**Mr. Byblow:** I believe I have raised this with the minister previously, respecting maintenance of staff housing in the outlying communities. I also, at one point, indicated to him that it was stated that the maintenance monies for this fiscal year that we are working in has already been expended and only emergency and absolutely necessary maintenance would be done, and the minister assured me that maintenance was continuing and that no units would be going without maintenance. I wonder if he could report what has transpired since that time, because certainly when I made inquiries at Yukon Housing following that I was able to confirm that there was a severe shortage of maintenance money for the

ongoing maintenance in staff housing.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Money is tight in this area, just like any area of the government, and we are doing the best we can with what we have. I do know that in the members' riding we do have a contract with private individuals for the purposes of maintenance, and I think that it is safe to say that throughout the territory, wherever it is needed, there is somebody available to help if something goes wrong. At the same time, in view of the times that we are living in, we are asking our tenants to be a little bit more careful and also to provide a very minimal amount of maintenance in everyday living within the apartments or housing that they are provided with, instead of turning around and calling upon government every time something goes wrong, as opposed to having call-outs which would not always be necessary if the individual took a little more of a considerate approach as far as the accommodation is concerned.

**Mr. Byblow:** I do not think I will get into a debate with the minister over pride of ownership, or any discussion relative to quality of housing, as I am sure we have been through that over the past four years. I do want to talk about the recoveries aspect on page 262. I note, under staff housing rent and utilities, a sum of \$535,000 and other, \$55,000. Just so that I understand that figure better, is that an internal charge back from education. How is that a recovery as cited in the budget?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** That would be strictly rents from individuals. The Department of Education does not rent accommodation from us. We provide accommodation, perhaps, in cases where teaching staff accommodation is necessary, but we charge the tenant.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister will note that there is something in the order of \$200,000 increase in the recoveries on rent, which as he explains, would in fact come from rent charged to tenants of occupied housing. I would like to ask the Minister why it became policy of the government this year to increase the basic rent in a majority of Yukon Housing units in the outlying communities by as much as 30, 40 and 60 percent, in some cases? As I understand the situation, they were certainly entitled to do that increase under the letter of law, but I would raise with the minister the spirit of the times that he made reference to just now, with respect to restraint, with respect to percentage increases. What justification did the minister give to go through with this policy?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** What was found was that in implementing economic rent throughout the territory there were a number of areas not actually included. I guess, when you use percentages, you also have to say "percentage of what?" It was felt, in fairness to other employees in those particular communities and throughout the territory, there had to be equity as far as our rental structure was concerned. From my perspective, as I am sure anyone looking at it rationally would agree, we had to get our rents to a comparable 1982 value — both rental structure and utilities — and that is exactly what we did. I do not think we are charging too much. People who do not wish to live in our accommodation can always go elsewhere, and they can always build their own homes, depending upon which community they are in. Now, the member opposite raised the question of Faro, in which I recognize there are no lots on the market, or that much private accommodation, but in other communities there is, and they can avail themselves of that if they do not wish to utilize the accommodation provided by the Yukon Housing Corporation.

I have to make the point clear. I do not think we should be looking at the housing corporation, especially when we are applying our housing in such a manner that is available for staff, providing accommodation to this type of individual who is working, or that it should be subsidized. I think it should be a situation where people are paying for it.

<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the member opposite disagrees with that. I cannot believe that because I recall the debates we had here three or four years ago and he always took the position that if you were going to rent a home or have rental accommodation provided, it should be paid for by the tenant.

**Mr. Byblow:** I think there are a number of factors coming into play in the debate over what constitutes a reasonable, or market, rent and certainly the minister is fully aware that, in many instances, in those outlying communities, I can say quite bluntly

that housing is of a substandard quality. Imposing a formula structure to the rents often becomes a very arbitrary situation of whether that is a fair figure. I do not wish to debate that specific point at this time. I think that I have to agree with the minister, to some extent, that there must be some relative association between the cost of maintaining a unit and the amount recovered from it, given that you are providing an acceptable standard of housing.

What I did raise, though, with the minister, was why he chose this particular year, in the spirit of the times, and in such a large proportion in one year. For three or four years previous, nothing had happened to the formula that had established those basic rents in those outlying communities. I am sure the minister is aware of the formula that is used which establishes a base rent, calculated against Whitehorse, with a reduction from that. To have done it in this particular year, at a time when salaries are under restraint, at a time when costs are not slowing down, has created quite a resentment within the teaching group who are affected by that decision.

At the same time, I again raise with this minister, as I did with the previous minister, it seems to me that we have a real problem when it comes to the whole housing situation facing teachers. On the one hand you have the obligation by the Department of Education to provide the quality of staffing in the communities and, on the other hand, you have a separate agency supplying the housing, and it often works at cross-purposes. I am sure the minister knows my thoughts on this from previous debates: housing is a working condition affecting quality of teaching.

<sup>14</sup> **Hon. Mr. Lang:** What can I say? As far as the rental structure was concerned, and the charge for utilities, it had to come in. In the particular case of the teaching staff, they got an increase this year, as opposed to anyone within the civil service, the point being that one could look to those units that we had been renting previously from the point of view that they had a pretty good deal up until this year. I am not arguing that, but it was felt that some parity and equity had to be assured throughout the system. The increases were discussed with their representatives within the union prior to being implemented.

I recognize the member opposite would also like to see the Minister of Education taking over housing and campgrounds, and I do not know what else the opposition would like to have her take over; maybe status of women. The government leader is quite pleased with the job I am doing in housing so I cannot see that happening within the next couple of days.

**Mr. Byblow:** Would the government leader like to confirm that?

**Mr. Kimmerly:** In the coming year, is it the intention of the department, considering rent increases, to stick with the "six and five" federal guideline?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** At this time, I do not know what increases will be coming forward. I think the philosophy of the Housing Corporation should be that if there are increases in utilities or whatever, it should be passed on to whomever is renting the accommodation. I think we are kidding ourselves if we say we are going to put a specific guideline in and if it costs more to run that particular unit, then that means you and I are paying that difference. Unless something happens that I am unaware of at the present time, I can just hope that our costs go down. Who knows? We always talk about increasing them; maybe the cost will go down with the energy retrofits we are doing in a number of our units. I think they will save the consumer and the tenants a fair amount of money.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a very specific question. On the supplementary information under expenditures there is a staff housing figure of \$670,000. Looking at the recoveries under staff housing there is a total of \$590,000. Am I correct in assuming that the costs of maintaining the staff housing are approximately \$80,000 more than what is recovered? Or am I not reading the information correctly?

<sup>15</sup> **Hon. Mr. Lang:** Actually, there would be more than that I believe, but \$670,000, subtracting \$535,000 would be the difference. The \$55,000 there is a change in format to isolate recovery from the City of Whitehorse and also a reduction in anticipated interest rates from bank accounts due to falling rates, as it is an

ongoing bank account that is kept. So really, I would say it is about \$150,000, and that is largely accounted for by the economic rent structure that we have here in the territory, which takes into account how far you are away from Whitehorse, what your amenities are. There is a list of a number of other criteria that dictates rent.

The other point, of course, is that there are a number of employees who are grandfathered into staff accommodation through the collective agreement which was signed six or seven years ago, and their rent can only go up so much per year, unless they move out of that particular dwelling on their own volition. So, I guess the answer to your question is that yes, there would be in the area of \$150,000 difference.

**Mr. Byblow:** Has the minister any figures at his disposal at this particular time as to how many units are not occupied and therefore accruing some cost to government, whether it be through any mortgage payments or utilities to keep that unit protected. Perhaps the minister could give me some idea at the same time of how many units we have together in total, against how many units are unoccupied.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** If the member opposite is trying to find out if we have any units for sale, if he wants to come and see me privately, I am sure I could fix him up. I could go through each particular community. As of November 1st, 1982, we had one rental/purchase home in Carcross, that was vacant. We had one vacant rent supplement, which is a one-bedroom apartment, in Haines Junction. In Swift River, we did not have any vacancies. In Teslin, we have three rental purchase units empty at the present time. In staff accommodation in Watson Lake, we have 6.3 vacancies. In Whitehorse we have a zero percent vacancy and, for applications for those units, we had 15 family applications to answer, as Mr. Kimmerly's question brought out earlier, and 10 senior citizen applications pending; for a total of 25. In Carmacks we had one unit available. In Mayo, three, and all that remaind are presently rented. I think that answers the member's questions.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister was giving me figures relative to staff housing; not any other community program housing?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** No, this was all housing. To my knowledge, I think most of our staff accommodation is pretty well utilized.

*Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$1,454,000 agreed to*

#### **On Loan Capital and Amortization**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The amount to be voted is \$10,000,000 for loan capital and \$7,049,000 for loan amortization. Those are the key numbers. Those are the two numbers that are being voted tonight.

**Mr. Byblow:** Because we are well into the year, if not half over, I assume that most of these monies have already been committed and are, for the most part, used? Is that a correct assumption? Could the government leader indicate if the loans to third parties are municipal monies.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Yes, we anticipate that, over the course of the year, we will spend \$10,000,000 in loans to third parties and development. The actual committed money, and firm figures, are the loan amortizations. This is the interest and the principal that we are required to pay over the course of this year to the federal government for outstanding loans.

*Loan Capital in the amount of \$10,000,000 agreed to*

*On Loan Amortization*

*Loan Amortization in the amount of \$7,049,000 agreed to*

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now return to Schedule A. I would like to let everybody know that there will be an opportunity to speak to each department before we carry it for the final time.

<sup>16</sup> *On Yukon Legislative Assembly*

*Yukon Legislative Assembly in the amount of \$1,157,000 agreed to*

*On Executive Council Office*

*Executive Council Office in the amount of \$1,431,000 agreed to*

*On Education*

*Education in the amount of \$25,323,000 agreed to*

*On Consumer and Corporate Affairs*

*Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the amount of \$1,074,000 agreed to*

*On Health and Human Resources*

*Health and Human Resources in the amount of \$25,136,000 agreed to*

*On Municipal and Community Affairs*

*Municipal and Community Affairs in the amount of \$6,223,000 agreed to*

*On Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations*

*Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations in the amount of \$1,637,000 agreed to*

*On Justice*

*Justice in the amount of \$9,288,000 agreed to*

*On Highways and Transportation*

*Highways and Transportation in the amount of \$25,640,000 agreed to*

*On Public Service Commission*

*Public Service Commission in the amount of \$1,126,000 agreed to*

*On Finance*

*Finance in the amount of \$3,338,000 agreed to*

*On Tourism Heritage and Cultural Resources*

*Tourism Heritage and Cultural Resources in the amount of \$2,588,000 agreed to*

*On Renewable Resources*

*Renewable Resources in the amount of \$4,817,000 agreed to*

*On Government Services*

*Government Services in the amount of \$6,276,000*

*On Yukon Housing Corporation*

*Yukon Housing Corporation in the amount of \$1,454,000 agreed to*

*On Loan Capital*

*Loan Capital in the amount of \$10,000,000 agreed to*

*On Loan Amortization*

*Loan Amortization in the amount of \$7,049,000 agreed to*

*On Total*

*Total in the amount of \$133,557,000 agreed to*

<sup>18</sup> *On Clause 2*

*Clause 2 agreed to*

*On Clause 3*

*Clause 3 agreed to*

*On Title*

*Title agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I move that you report Bill No. 3 without amendment.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now take a short break and after the break we will return with Bill No. 10, *Wildlife Act*

*Recess*

19 **Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole to order.

*On Wildlife Act*

*On Clause 1*

**Mr. Porter:** Just a point of clarification: is general debate not allowed prior to proceeding to clause-by-clause debate?

**Mr. Chairman:** As I am led to believe, the general debate is on clause 1.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think everyone is aware of the reason for the amendments to the *Wildlife Act*. They are to make the changes so that trappers are compensated exactly in the same manner as the outfitters are compensated, if we infringe on their licence without giving them adequate notice. The other part of it is to allow the outfitters to lose their licence without losing their concession, if for some reason they are guilty of some breach of the *Wildlife Act*, so they can recover their investment through sale of their assets and the concession. The others are just a couple of typographical errors and things like that in the act. Basically, it is about those two things that allows the outfitter to lose his licence without losing his concession and puts the trappers under the same standard as the outfitters.

**Mr. Porter:** I agree with the government when it moves to recognize the principle of compensation with respect to traplines that have been revoked. However, in this amendment to the existing ordinance, I do not think that the government essentially has adequately addressed the issue of compensation. Under this legislation the government deems revocation of a trapping concession is worth twice the average annual income of the holder of the concession and his assignees, if any, in the period of three years immediately preceding the date on which notice is given.

I think this action is constructive but, simply put, does not go far enough. It would be a fair statement to say, in large part, that over the years, trapping, as an industry, has been neglected. However, with the current down trend in the economy, and providing that fur prices hold, I expect the industry will, once again, have a greater degree of prominence in the overall economy.

20 In drafting the original ordinance and the subsequent amendments contained in the bill before us, the government has only touched the issue of compensation. For the benefit of the government, and as the PC East member would say, for the edification of the members opposite, I will today present some of the existing ideas on the area of compensation.

The first step that should be examined in the development of the compensation policy is the establishment of principles of compensation. These principles would determine the areas of compensation and the process to be used in arriving at a final settlement. Of course, the development of any policy, if it is to be done right, would necessitate the involvement of those people most affected, the Yukon trappers, and other groups such as the Conservation Society and the Wildlife Advisory Committee.

To illustrate the inadequacy of the bill before us today, I will now describe some accepted ideas regarding trapline compensation. I will limit my remarks to the areas of direct losses by individuals, damage to, or destruction of, trapline improvements, depletion of furbearers, increased trapping costs, and the very important area of social and cultural losses. Under direct losses incurred by individuals — in this area, should an individual's economic welfare be reduced in any measurable way by the impact of industrial development, he or she would be compensated as a general rule. Damage to, or destruction of, trapline improvements indicate physical evidence of direct loss, and, as a rule, are easy to deal with in a claim for compensation. Trapline improvements could include the following: trails, caches, dikes, dams, and all these improvements represent an investment on the part of the trapper.

The depletion of furbearers, however, is not as easy to determine. It may occur as a result of development activity and reduction of wildlife activity. This may occur as a direct result of the destruction of habitat, or the wildlife population may simply be forced to move to less developed areas as development approaches. The reduction in the potential harvest along the trapline to the trapper represents a

decline in the value as an asset and also removes potential earnings for the future.

Increased trapping costs, in a situation where a concentrated level of industrial development occurs, the effect may be that the furbearing animals may move to more isolated parts of the trapline. If a situation like this did occur, the trapper would be forced to follow the game and construct a whole new set of trails and related infrastructure such as trapline cabins.

This brings us to the most important area, the social costs incurred as a result of damage to a trapline or non-renewal of a trapping concession. This area is a very difficult area in which to establish a fair level of compensation. I believe the only process where social costs can be measured would be through a process of negotiation. Should the negotiation process prove futile, then the negotiating parties would have their case arbitrated by such a body as, say, the compensation review committee, which is already provided for in the existing ordinance.

21 Trapping, to many of the people in Yukon, is not simply a hobby or an activity undertaken to supplement their income. For many people in Yukon it is a way of life, and it is not an easy lifestyle. As many people know it is a very difficult lifestyle as well as rigorous and demanding. It is also a lifestyle a lot of people choose because it is a free lifestyle and it gives people a great sense of independence, something that is not found too often in today's society.

The whole business of compensation in this particular area is very difficult to determine because if too many people of that particular lifestyle were disrupted in a permanent way, there is no degree of compensation that you could possibly come up with that would meet the loss that they have suffered. That does not remove the onus of responsibility on government and industry, where practical, to look at compensation on this particular issue.

As I stated, the whole area of compensation is a difficult area to determine. There have not been too many precedents set throughout this country or North America, in terms of how a compensation formula should be arrived at, however some effort has been made. I will now turn to some of the existing programs that have been set in the past.

When the pipeline debate was very hot in Yukon, the whole issue of trapline compensation was one of the major items for discussion. In preparation, during that discussion, the Yukon Trappers Association put out some ideas. For the purpose of discussion here, I would like to repeat some of them. They called for the payment on the basis of a fixed sum per mile on the trapline crossed by the pipeline. The second recommendation was the payment to trappers of an annual allowance based on the cost-of-living and thirdly, restoration of traplines. The fourth area was payment according to the area damaged and the estimated effect on each species. The fifth area was payment based on harvests produced in the previous years to be made for five years valued at each year's market price.

A very different kind of program was undertaken in Manitoba in the Lake Winnipeg regulation and Churchill River diversion registered trapline program. This was undertaken by Manitoba Hydro. This program was formulated to provide relocation assistance and incentives to trappers whose activities were disrupted by hydro development. It was intended as an interim program, subject to review and amendment if compensation is found to be insufficient, with retroactive payments to be made should the amended program provide the greater assistance. The compensation provided for varies from the extent and duration of loss. The percentage and permanence of loss are determined through consultation with the affected trapper, the conservation officer, the president of the local fur council and biologists.

For 100 percent loss of trapline the trapper is provided with a new trapline together with an initial payment equivalent to the highest individual harvest on the trapline in the preceding 10 years, valued at present prices, plus an annual subsidy for five years based on the value of furs trapped on the new line. This subsidy is 100 percent of the value for the first three years, 50 percent for the fourth year and 25 percent for the fifth year.

For permanent partial loss of production the trapper is given either the opportunity to relocate to a new line with compensation



as above, or annual compensation for five years equivalent to the highest annual production in the preceding 10 years of those furs no longer available, valued at the prices prevailing in the year of payment. If the second option is chosen, the trapper is paid an annual subsidy equivalent to 100 percent of the value of the aquatic furs trapped over the first three years, 50 percent for the fourth year, and 25 percent for the fifth year.

For temporary partial loss of production the trapper is given the choice of relocating with the same financial compensation or accepting annual compensation for five years based on the highest annual harvest during the preceding ten years. In addition, where trappers are relocated, an aircraft is provided for aerial survey. For damages, permanent incidental expenses for cabins access roads, et cetera are covered to a maximum of \$2,000 payable on the basis of proven need. Community traplines affected are compensated in the form of some local improvement which will offset the loss of trapping benefits.

If a trapper dies or becomes unable to trap during the period of compensation, payments are made to his estate. Compensation is paid to new trappers only if no other trapline is available.

For a third and final look at compensation on traplines, we move to British Columbia Hydro, and their registered trapline program. This program was developed to provide a standardized basis for compensating for trapline losses, previously handled on an *ad hoc* basis, similar in nature to the Manitoba Hydro settlement, consisting of compensation for loss production incentive programs and rebuilding expenses. Implementation of the program is the responsibility of a consulting committee composed of representatives of the BC Trappers Association, BC Fish and Wildlife Branch and the BC Hydro and Power Authority at field level. The program is carried out by an inspection committee consisting of local representatives of the same three organizations. For 100 percent permanent loss of production from generation projects the trapper is given the opportunity to relocate to a new trapline and is compensated as follows: an initial payment, equivalent to the highest individual trappers production during the preceding 10 year period, valued at present prices, plus an annual subsidy equivalent to 100 percent of the value of furs trapped on the new line for the first two years; 75 percent for the third year; 50 percent for the fourth year; and 25 percent for the fifth year; plus incidental expenses for construction of cabins, trails, et cetera, with labour valued at \$7.50 per hour to a maximum of \$3,500 per trapline.

<sup>21</sup> For permanent partial loss of production, the trapper is given annual compensation for partial loss of furbearing animals equivalent to the highest annual production during the preceding ten years the fur is no longer available. Compensation is paid for five years, valued at the prices in the year of payment, plus an annual subsidy based on the value of furs trapped in years after development as before, plus incidental expenses to the value of \$3,500 per trapline. To prevent overtrapping, payments based on furs trapped are paid to a maximum of 200 percent of the historic ten-year high production.

For partial loss of productivity through right-of-way construction, compensation is paid for lost improvements with dwellings valued at \$7.50 per square foot and labour at \$7.50 per hour, plus incidental expenses for construction of cabins, trails, et cetera to a maximum of \$2,500.

For permanent loss of production, an aircraft is provided to permit assessment of the trapline. Trappers have the option of claiming compensation for lost dwellings. If this is accepted, they cannot claim for the cost of building new cabins unless they build more than the number lost.

All of these ideas serve to indicate that the area of trapping compensation, as addressed in this particular amendment, is only the beginning. It is only uncovering the whole area of compensation. As to the question of the economics of such a program, or programs, it must be remembered that in each of these cases, where damage to traplines incurred by a developer, it is not necessarily the government or agencies of the government who end up paying the costs. It is those developers who take on the development who also take on the responsibility to compensate to trappers, or trapper, affected.

In respect to the amendment before us, all we simply have is a compensation package looking at a three year annual period of harvest. My recommendation, at this particular point, would be to leave the legislation as is, which I understand to mean, and I could be corrected on this matter, is that compensation will be paid under the existing ordinance as deemed proper by the compensation review board that is presently set up under legislation. My understanding is that the provision that we are enacting here to affect trappers' compensation is presently provided for in the legislation only as it affects outfitters' concessions. If that is the case, then I would simply ask that the provision, as is, be left alone and what should happen is that the government should work toward developing a complete and comprehensive policy on compensation, together with all of the people who would be affected so that, in a sense, we could have a government that is working together with its people.

<sup>22</sup> **Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member across the floor operates on one principle and this government operates on another. This government's principle is that the government, the people, the taxpayers own the resources; not the trapper, not the outfitter. The trapping licence or the outfitting licence is not a sale of assets to the trapper or the outfitter; it is a privilege to use those resources that belong to the taxpayer and in return the government receives income taxes from the beneficial use of those resources.

The concept that the member across the floor is putting forward is that once we give an outfitter or a trapper a licence we give him that as his right to have; that he owns all of the resources that are on that land, whether they be sheep, in the case of outfitters, or wolf, or marten in the case of a trapper. That is one concept that this government has taken a very strong stand on. As far as we are concerned, the resource belongs to the taxpayer. The licence to trap is only that — a licence to trap, as long as the government gives them that licence. Because they have some investment in their trapline, or in their outfitting concession, we have made a policy that if we do not give them advance warning of at least two years we will pay them compensation in lieu of that warning. That is the principle that these amendments are on.

I would also like to state that these amendments do not deal with compensation for what any other person — other than the government — would have to make if they infringed on the trapper's trapline. Any other compensation that the trapper has because some corporation or pipeline infringed on the trapline would be separate and apart, and have nothing to do with this. That would be a negotiation between the trapper and industry. I would like to state that I hope Foothills and any other organization would take into consideration our position here. High compensation from Foothills or any other organization would actually be detrimental to the Yukon Territory. We would hope that any organization would take into consideration the intent of our legislation and use it as a guideline.

<sup>23</sup> I guess I cannot say much more on it. The member across the floor gave us a lot of information about what happened in Manitoba and what happened in British Columbia, but I can only say again that our position is that the taxpayers own the resource and that is a totally different philosophy than that in British Columbia or Manitoba, or what has developed there. We are trying to make sure that it does not develop here. A licence is a licence; it does not grant any rights or privileges to the people.

**Mr. Byblow:** A couple of questions for the minister on his last statement: he indicated that developers, such as the pipeline, could be subject to other kinds of claims from a trapper whose line might be affected by some work that is done. Is it the minister's view that the schedule of compensation, or the level of compensation, outlined in the bill would form the basis, or a standard, on which compensation should be paid by a private developer, should they affect the line?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, that is exactly the point that I was trying to make. I was trying to say that we have set the guidelines here that we would hope that everyone would follow, including the pipeline or anyone, such as a mining company.

In regard to the pipeline, incidentally, I would think that if you talked to most trappers, they would tell you that the pipeline has



brought more fur to the trapline than it has ever taken away. I am very familiar with pipelines. I spent a few years in northern British Columbia where there are pipelines everywhere you go, and it certainly has not hurt the trapping industry.

**Mr. Penikett:** I always thought pipelines brought gas not fur, but anyway, let me ask the minister about an interesting complication, or contradiction, that I have just discovered in their policy. If he is suggesting that where a developer may affect someone's interest in a line, and that developer should pay compensation on a similar basis to that outlined by the government, or on which the government pays compensation, I wonder if the minister could then indicate to the House, since he has indicated that the government owns the resource — an interesting statement from the members opposite — would the government also, in addition to the compensation that the pipeline had paid to the trapper on this basis, want compensation on the same level as the resource, because its interests had been affected by the developer, such as the pipeline?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not believe that the government would ask for compensation from a company like Foothills for putting a pipeline through the territory, because, as I say, I do not believe that the pipeline would adversely affect the wildlife. Certainly, any government anywhere in the world has to recognize that if they are going to have economic development, and generate enough revenue to support their government and their country, you have to have economic development which has the effect of sooner or later infringing to a certain extent on the wildlife.

Now, the function of the renewable resources department is to try to mitigate that as much as possible and try to protect the wildlife as much as possible to make sure that we have it. But, certainly, if a mine was to open in the Macmillan Pass area, we certainly would not ask for compensation on the one hand for some loss of a small part of a trapline and, at the same time, try and give them incentives to go there and develop the mines so that we can have economic development in the territory. So, I do not see it as even being comprehended that we would ask for compensation.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am stimulated to enter the debate about compensation, especially at the turn that it is taking. I wish to express a position that is opposed to the minister's position and I ask a question about it. The minister stated that it was, "detrimental to the Yukon Territory", if the pipeline, or any other development interest, needed to pay high compensation, in the minister's words. I clearly disagree with that and in a very, very strenuous way. I would like to explain my disagreement and ask a question about it.

The trappers' compensation clause here is identical to the outfitters' compensation clause in the main bill and it is predicated on the assumption that the minister correctly states that the resources belong to the taxpayer or the government and a licence is granted. In fact, the licence can be taken away with no compensation as long as proper notice is given. It is only a compensation for lack of notice. That is a clear policy and it has previously been the law. What the minister has now stated is that this compensation model ought to be the model for third party compensation, or compensation paid by developers to the owner of a trapline or the licensee who occupies the trapline.

It is an entirely different situation when that occurs. It is the taxpayers who own the resource, not the developer. Let me elaborate a little bit. If there is a mine, or a pipeline, or whatever, to develop in an outfitting area, it may make a profit for the company and put the outfitter out of business, or reduce his business. It is the same for a trapline and the same, in fact, for a placer miner and a fisherman. There are competing interests in the use of the resource. What the minister is talking about is development of non-renewable resources and the policy is being stated that it is the government's policy that the previous user of the land, the previous business person in an economic sense, is to get compensation based on three years' use, or two years' use, even if it is twice the annual net income from three years' use.

<sup>26</sup> No sensible businessman is going to sell his business for that figure: approximately six times his income. It is a renewable resource. It is a lifetime guarantee of income if managed properly. It belongs to the taxpayer ultimately and the minister is clearly

stating that the developer ought to be able to come in and change it and pay a compensation of only six years' net profit. In the case of the Yukon outfitting areas and traplines, that is absolutely ludicrous.

The prospect of a pipeline coming in, with a temporary benefit to some Yukoners, and a substantial benefit to non-Yukoners, the company owners and the eventual users of the gas, ought to be put beside the interests of those people who live here. If it is going to interrupt the existing economic life of many, many people, the compensation ought to be far more than six years' net income. The bill, of course, does not speak about those particular issues, but the minister clearly made statements about them and I would ask if he would reconsider, in any way, or if it is the policy of the department that renewable resources are so undervalued.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I said that I would expect, or hope, that industry would use it as guidelines. The member across the floor is wrong in one respect: it would not be six years' compensation. Our bill says that if we do not give two years' notice, we will give two times the average of the previous three years' net income which would mean that, regardless of whether the trapper even trapped the rest of his line, he would get at least two years of his bottom line income that he would report to the federal government on his income tax form as his net that he would pay tax on. He would get that without doing anything.

I am saying that that should be the guideline. If industry is going to interfere with someone's trapline, they should use that as a guideline. I do not care if they are interfering with it for ten years, that should be the guideline that they use. I am not saying that they should only pay them for two years; what I am saying is that they should use that as a guideline. The reason I say that it is detrimental is that if the pipeline came through and paid them very significant amounts of money, such as the member for Campbell suggests, which they could do because they are passing the costs on to someone in the United States, what we have to recognize is that every industry that wants to cross the trapline, or whatever, in the future would be faced with that as a precedent. It would virtually almost close down any small operation, or any type of operation that wanted to cross a trapline or interfere with a trapline in any respect in the territory. The precedent would be set by Foothills Pipe Lines, for example, who would be paying enormous compensation for something that was not justifiable.

A pipeline does not interfere with traplines; it has been proven thousands of times over that it makes traplines more efficient. The pipeline itself would only be going through here; it would only affect the traplines for two years or perhaps three at the maximum. After that there would be absolutely no effect on the trapline at all. It sounds great that the trapper should get compensation for that interference on their trapline, but basically, when you stop and think about it, it would be detrimental to the territory for future development.

**Mr. Penikett:** I would like to get back into this fascinating discussion of development strategy and compensation that the minister has begun. I want to pursue this question, as it has some interesting consequences for this bill.

This minister indicated, in my view, a somewhat unfortunate preference for non-renewable resource development over renewable resource development. It is an issue I might want to pursue with him sometime, as he is the Minister of Renewable Resources in this government: an implication that some kind of temporary extractive function would always, and necessarily, be in the better interests of the territory than the maintenance of a renewable resource. I think it is a dubious economic proposition.

He also said that the government would not want compensation for its interest in this resource that may be exterminated forever because it would not be in the interest of economic development. I would like to ask him what his view would be, having stated that policy, in respect to a dam project that may flood a river valley or might put a trapper or two out of business, and may have serious and permanent effects on wildlife habitat in a certain area, or would in true economic costs considerably affect a net capital loss for the territory in terms of timber and wildlife. Would it be the minister's view that NCP, for example, would not be required to pay

compensation, even on the basis of this bill, to trappers affected by such development? I ask this question in all seriousness because though he would argue that pipelines somehow help trappers, surely he would not argue that a dam project or a flooded river valley would help trappers; or, perhaps he would.

**Mr. Tracey:** First of all, it is a hypothetical question. On the other hand, I suppose maybe the member could say we should sit and freeze in the dark, but I think he is looking for development in this territory; he is looking for people to come here; he is looking for a source of cheap electricity, and any such project would only be developed for the benefit of the people in the territory, and all of these environmental costs are covered in the environmental assessment that is done for any major project in the territory. Certainly that is one of the things that is considered. If it was more beneficial for the trappers to stay there then the dam project would not go ahead in the first instance. I am sure that the member would also recognize that in certain cases it is perhaps beneficial to the residents of this territory who own the fur resource that the trapper has to, rather than have him trap it, find more benefit in flooding in order to have the generation of power, so that he would have a constant source of energy.

**Mr. Penikett:** I accept the minister's point that it may well be in the public interest to have a hydro project in some river valley rather than some trapline, if that is the choice.

» However, I want to ask the minister what his view is of the private interests of trappers who may have been there for a good many years. If you are going to do a true cost accounting of a development project, such as a hydro dam, and you are really going to weigh what is in the public interest, you must look at both sides of the ledger. You must look at the benefits that will be generated by a hydro project and the costs that will be accrued from loss of timber, loss of revenue, loss of wildlife habitat and loss of wildlife, and loss of some family's income by virtue of a trapline going out of business.

Let me ask him two questions. Would he believe that NCPC would be obliged to pay compensation to the trapper and two, would it be on the basis of the kind of law laid down in this bill?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** It would be, I would hope, on the basis laid down in this bill. Certainly, any projects such as that going ahead would take many years, because from the start of a hydro project to completion is about 13 years, at this time. I think the trapper will have ample advance warning. In fact, it would be incumbent on this government to sometime tell him that he has two years left in trapping, and he would have to lose his trapline. This bill also covers that aspect of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is getting late in the evening, and I would move that you report progress on Bill No. 10 and beg leave to sit again.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Speaker:** I will now call the House to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committees?

**Mr. Phillipsen:** The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 3, *Second Appropriation Act, 1982/83*, and directed me to report the same without amendment. Further, the Committee has considered Bill No. 10, *An Act to Amend the Wildlife Act*, and directed me to report progress on same.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees. Are you agreed?

**Some Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** May I have your further pleasure?

**Mr. Penikett:** I move, seconded by the member for Whitehorse South Centre, that the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, seconded by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre, that we do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

**Mr. Speaker:** This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

*The House adjourned at 9:28 p.m.*

**The following Sessional Paper was tabled November 29, 1982**

82-2-11

Address by Hon. John Munro, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on November 27, 1982, to Members of the Assembly and response by Hon. Chris Pearson, Government Leader. (Taylor)

See Appendix

**An Address by**

**The Honourable John C. Munro, PC, MP**

Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

to

**Members of the Legislative Assembly of Yukon**

and

**Response by**

**The Honourable Chris Pearson**

Government Leader

**November 27, 1982 — 11:00 a.m.**



**ON THE OCCASION OF AN ADDRESS BY THE FEDERAL MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON THE SUBJECT OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE YUKON, DELIVERED IN THE YUKON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1982, AT 11:00 A.M.**

*The members of the Legislative Assembly being present, the Hon. Mr. Munro enters the Chambers*

**Mr. Speaker:** It gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to introduce to all honourable members and guests, today, the Honourable John Munro, representative of the Government of Canada.

Mr. Munro has asked for an opportunity to make a major announcement to all honourable members respecting constitutional development in Yukon. I would now invite Mr. Munro to take the floor in order to address the members and assembled guests.

**Hon. Mr. Munro:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am delighted to be here today. I would like to express my appreciation to your Honour, to the Government Leader, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the members of the assembly for your courtesy in providing me this opportunity to talk to you on very short notice, indeed. I wanted to meet with you in person so that I can elaborate on the brief announcement I made in Ottawa yesterday with respect to some matters that are extremely important to all Yukoners.

I have been Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for nearly three years. We have taken the opportunity to sit down together, in one way or another, Yukoners and myself, in one way or another, on a number of occasions. I think I have come to know your aspirations and I believe you will agree that I have expressed genuine sympathy and support for advancing the social, economic and political development of Yukon. I want to speak to you about the development of Yukon; now, and through this decade, and about the active participation of the native population and non-native Yukoners in that development.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to tell this assembly that the federal government has decided to forward on significant new political and financial arrangements with Yukon despite the very difficult economic times we are all experiencing.

The recession has taken a terrible toll in jobs and businesses and has undermined the economic health of the whole country. The impact of the recession has been particularly severe in Yukon.

I am personally gratified by the exercise in restraint which has been demonstrated by the territorial government, and by your determination to pull together with the Government of Canada, the provinces and the private sector in rebuilding sustainable economic growth. At the same time, I share with you confidence in the ability of Canadians to work our way out of these difficulties we are having and realize once again our great potential.

It is gratifying to me as Minister to witness the progress that is being made here, in so many concrete ways, in the relations between the Indian and the non-Indian populations, particularly. A healthy and dynamic political process is alive and well in Yukon. All members of the Legislative Assembly should draw a great deal of satisfaction from the leadership role which you are playing in advancing this relationship.

I am pleased, for example, by the reaffirmation by the Yukon Government of your commitment to work closely with the Council for Yukon Indians and the Indian community, and to pursue the land claims as a matter of first priority. The successful completion of negotiations is vitally important to the future social, economic and political well-being of Yukon.

Claims settlement will be the first step in building the social partnership between Indian and non-Indian Yukoners which will be the foundation for the economic and political development of Yukon through this decade. The next step, and equally important, I am sure you will agree, is to ensure that the Indian population will have full and equal access to the political structures of Yukon.

In reviewing federal policy on native claims more than a year

ago, I said this, while on the Yukon: "I ask for the support and understanding of all Canadians — individuals, associations and special interest groups of all kinds. At a time when our country is struggling to redefine itself, to determine what kind of future we want for everyone in this land, we must in all fairness pay particular attention to the needs and aspirations of native people without whose good faith and support we cannot fulfill the promise that is Canada."

It's encouraging, then, to me to know that many sub-agreements have been reached in the Yukon Indian land claims negotiations. These include the elders' agreement, the agreement on hunting, fishing and trapping, the agreements on land use planning, education, health care and social programs, the agreement on housing, and the agreement on community land selection. I know that you share my confidence and optimism that an overall agreement-in-principle can be reached in the near future.

I'd like to congratulate all of you for your support for an initiative such as this which means so much to the Indian community and indeed, so much to the future of Yukon and, indeed, Canada as a whole.

I have a special reason for saying this. I believe it is very significant for the future of Yukon that members of this assembly regard themselves as representatives of all the people in their constituencies. I believe we all know some places in the world, not so fortunate as Canada, where people of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds have no political rights and only limited civil rights. We know that that is not the case here. We know of places where people do not have such claims, and do not pretend to make such claims. Yukon is fortunate in being able to call on the strength and contributions of all sectors of the political community and to work together in a democratic way. This is an essential part of the Canadian tradition. I am happy to see the tradition is alive and well in this Assembly.

I would like to turn now to three new developments which are going to make an important contribution to the future development of Yukon. It is these developments which I would like to celebrate with you today.

A year ago, when the economic prospects for Yukon were buoyant and there was good cause for optimism it would have given me a great deal more satisfaction, as Minister, to be addressing this Assembly on matters of northern development or the development of Yukon in particular.

The serious downturn in the economy has dampened that satisfaction in this sense. It has reminded all of us that Yukon is extremely vulnerable to volatile international markets. As you are aware, the economy of Yukon depends on mining and government services for about 85 percent of its gainful activity. Clearly, this does not constitute a secure foundation.

As you are also painfully aware, Yukon soon will have no operating mines for the first time since the gold rush days at the turn of the century. The depressed world mineral markets, the economic situation at the mines, the employment losses, the business losses, are more severe than any of us could have contemplated a year ago.

The closing of United Keno mine, the closing of Cyprus Anvil and now the imminent closing of Whitehorse Copper, are having terrible consequences — not only for the mining organizations and the employees, but also for the communities throughout Yukon.

The recession has focussed attention on fundamental weaknesses. The lack of an agricultural base, and the lack of diversified manufacturing, expose the population to the impact of sudden shifts in markets for minerals, which have been the major source of wealth in the territory. As long as these conditions prevail, the core population is likely to remain relatively small. The economy will not be capable of generating sufficient revenues to finance the level of public services which Yukoners have come to expect.

Under these circumstances, then, Yukon will continue to depend on direct and indirect expenditures by the federal government. In per capita terms, transfer payments to Yukon are nearly three times the payments to Prince Edward Island, and nearly eight times the average for all the provinces. Regrettably, this level of dependency is not likely to moderate in the foreseeable future, for reasons we

have just discussed.

On the other hand, the economic downturn has not dampened your enthusiasm, or mine, for moving forward with the political development of Yukon. This, indeed, is the first of the three elements I want to address today: the first being the political development of Yukon and now the achievement of responsible and politically accountable government.

We have made steady progress in this regard over the last few years. This progress includes the gradual shift in *de facto* executive responsibility from federally-appointed officials to representatives elected by Yukoners. The executive council includes, in addition to the government leader, who is also responsible for several key portfolios, ministers responsible for municipal and community affairs, housing, health, public works, justice, education, tourism and other government services.

<sup>93</sup> This assembly conducts its business in the Canadian parliamentary tradition. The assembly, in fact, is older than its counterparts in several of the provinces. Party structures are well established. The system is robust. After elections, it is capable of orderly transfer of power from one territorial government to another. By a steady devolution of responsibility, Yukon is standing on the threshold of fully responsible and politically accountable government. This is an accomplishment in which members of this assembly and all Yukoners can feel real pride and satisfaction.

The progress that Yukon has made in its evolution toward responsible government has not come easily. But is not unusual. History tells us that responsible government is not bestowed. It comes through struggle. It is something you are impatient to acquire, something you are willing to fight for. You have fought for it, and you have earned it.

In Yukon, the evolution has had its ups and downs, reflecting the shifting fortunes of the economy and the ebb and flow of populations. But the determination to achieve responsible and politically accountable government has never flagged here.

As Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I have had many detailed discussions with elected officials, with representatives of various organizations, and with other Yukoners, on the whole question of political development.

You have told me, for example, that Yukoners want to be free from the veto power which Ottawa holds over your important decisions. You have told me you want to rid yourselves of another government looking over your shoulder when you are planning programs. You have told me in a number of ways that you want to have a greater say in the development of this great land. You have told me you want recognition of your role in the broader Canadian community.

The federal government has been listening. The federal government has been responding positively to your demands for the devolution of powers and responsibility. As Minister, I have been party to this devolution. I have been applauding your march to responsible and politically accountable government.

The devolution toward responsible government in Yukon has taken place in the spirit of nation-building that is part of the overall political development of Canada. This is something all Canadians can truly rejoice in.

We are now prepared, as I announced in Ottawa yesterday, to recognize in law, responsible government for Yukon once final agreement has been reached in the comprehensive land claims with the Council for Yukon Indians. And, as, I repeat, it is my feeling, and, I am sure, that of many in the Yukon government, that this can be achieved very soon.

What does this mean; recognition in law of responsible government? It means the Yukon will now have significant new legal powers. These are legal powers that you have been asking for.

The legal changes, which will occur in due course will, for example, authorize members of the elected executive to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada and with provincial governments. These changes will also remove my power, as Minister, to instruct the Commissioner of Yukon in the exercise of his duties. The Commissioner would then assume a position like that of a Lieutenant-Governor in a province. The advice and assistance of the Commissioner will be particularly important to the

Yukon Government during the challenging times ahead.

Provincial status, however, is not a realistic objective for Yukon at this time. I know that provincial status has been the objective for many Yukoners for some time, including members of the Assembly, but Yukoners themselves tell me that we must face realities.

I have already mentioned some of them: the lack of an agricultural base and the lack of a manufacturing industry, both of which would give stability to employment, stability to the economy and stability to government revenues; the relatively small population, a population which can be highly transient due to volatile economic conditions elsewhere; the heavy reliance on the federal transfer payments in the funding of territorial services; the importance for the federal government to retain its ownership, and more particularly, I think, in view of some misunderstanding here, its present jurisdiction over Canadian land and resources.

<sup>94</sup> If I have been reading accurately the information that I have been receiving over the last two or three years, you have been telling me that you want greater powers to make more of the decisions affecting your lives and your future here in Yukon. I know that some of you have been identifying these greater powers with provincial status. But I do not think we should get hung up on provincial status as such. I believe that for the time being, and taking into consideration the economic realities, fully responsible and politically accountable government gives Yukon ample scope to control or influence matters of a local nature.

I would like to turn now to the second important development, namely, the introduction of formula financing for Yukon. In my view, this is going to make a significant contribution to your future economic development. The federal government is committed to the establishment of formula financing in order to assist Yukon in developing progressive levels of program planning and fiscal responsibility and accountability.

First of all, it will enable the Yukon Government to plan.

Second, it will provide you with a predictable cash flow.

Third, it will free you from the present bureaucratic process for program planning and fiscal accountability. It will confirm that planning and accountability rest with you, the Government of Yukon.

And fourth, it will provide you with an incentive to increase your own revenues. If you decide to raise new revenues from sales tax or some other instrument, Yukon will benefit 100 percent. You will not, as now, be penalized by a corresponding reduction in your annual transfer payments.

The third development I would like to speak about today is the federal government's decision to introduce a system of discretionary revenues. This relates to the whole question of assisting Yukon to meet the incidental costs of northern resource development. Some have suggested we should call this a fund for resource mitigation. That is a suggestion I heard just an hour or so ago, and it may be a very adequate term.

Over the last two years or so, you have been forthright in expressing your grievances over being exposed to the social and economic costs of resource development while not being eligible for what you perceive to be a fair share of the potential benefits of resource development.

In view of these concerns, the federal government has decided to develop appropriate mechanisms that will provide Yukon with a certain level of discretionary revenues. The cabinet has authorized me, together with several of my colleagues, to bring forward proposals in the very near future. I expect that these proposals will expand on the concept of the Yukon heritage fund. But, again, I would re-emphasize here, in terms of the connotation given "heritage", perhaps "resource mitigation fund" would be more appropriate, in terms of the immediacy of this needed incremental amount that you require.

I believe that you will agree with me that this is a day for celebration. The federal government has been listening closely to your legitimate concerns for a greater voice and for greater powers in the development of your affairs in Yukon, and the federal government has, I think, been supportive and responsive. The measures I have announced today will go a long way toward consolidating the gains you have made in recent years, and provide

you with even greater incentives for future growth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me comment briefly on one or two political developments as I anticipate them.

First, with regard to achieving responsible government in law, the progress that we will make together is contingent, as I have indicated, on a satisfactory conclusion to the land claims negotiations.

The land claims negotiations, in turn, will only be concluded when Yukon Indians feel their rights and capabilities are adequately protected in Yukon's political structures and processes.

The challenge, as I see it, is to work toward achieving consensus on what these guarantees should be. I am prepared to discuss the setting up of a tripartite process with the CYI and the Yukon Government to deal with this subject at the appropriate time.

I support the Indian people in their objective to be accepted as equal partners in the future development of Yukon.

A second matter on the future agenda, of course, is the whole question of land.

I am aware of the desire on the part of many Yukoners to have a greater voice in the determination of land use. I am certainly prepared to work cooperatively with the Yukon Government in land use planning. I am prepared, further, subsequent to implementing a comprehensive and cooperative planning process, to recommend to the federal government the transfer of blocks of land for parks and recreation, for agriculture, and for community and economic development to the Yukon Government for its administration.

Finally, I want to stress the importance of the federal and territorial governments working closely together in the future. We should clarify roles and establish acceptable working relationships in areas of mutual concern. I am thinking of constitutional processes that would be appropriate to land use planning, economic development, and renewable resource management. There may be some other areas which Yukon, as well as the federal government, would like to add to that list.

<sup>95</sup> Since my appointment as Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development nearly three years ago, I have come to appreciate the dedication to public service of members of the Yukon Government and the Legislative Assembly. I am looking forward to working closely with you in developing the future potential of Yukon. I believe that the three measures I have announced, and the other proposals for our joint consideration, will go a long way toward realizing our common goals.

Thank, you, Mr. Speaker.

*Applause*

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Munro.

I thank the Hon. Minister for his address today and, at this time, I would like to turn the floor over to the Hon. Government Leader, the Hon. Chris Pearson, for a reply on behalf of the Government of Yukon.

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I would like to first start out by welcoming the Minister to our House. It is very nice to have you here and we are very pleased that we have the opportunity to meet with you on this special occasion.

When we first heard that you were coming, Mr. Minister, to make a major announcement, we thought that it might be in respect to Cyprus Anvil or you might be coming with some more money to help us with our job creation programs; however, because it is so important to us, we appreciate that you have taken the time to come and talk to us about constitutional development because that, too, is very important.

Self-government is dear to the heart of every Yukoner. You, Mr. Minister, were quite correct in your statement that responsible government is not bestowed, it is earned. We think that we have been fighting hard. Believe me, we will continue to fight hard, and I am sure that you expect that.

Yukoners know this full well. We have been fighting for self-government since 1908 and we know that eventually we are going to achieve it. Thus, we were very pleased to hear of your undertaking to amend the *Yukon Act* to confirm responsible government in Yukon. And for that, we thank you very much.

We must make it clear to you Mr. Minister, however, that we do not see that the enshrinement of responsible government in law is in any way connected to the settlement of Yukon Indian land claims. This has never been a condition, nor is it proper for it to be. I would like to thank the Minister, too, for his undertaking to proceed with a formula to support our financing. This will free us, at last, from annual negotiations with the federal bureaucracy over the details of expenditures that have been authorized by Yukon's elected members. I have fought, ever since becoming elected, for formula financing. We thank you most sincerely, and unreservedly, for moving very decisively on this issue.

Further, we would like to thank the Minister for the federal government's decision to provide Yukon with a certain level of discretionary revenue — a very interesting term — especially if this means a Yukon heritage fund and a form of resource revenue sharing. There are some issues, however, on which we disagree, and I must state them frankly.

The first concerns land for all Yukoners. It has always been the position of the Government of Yukon, and I thought the position of all parties, that the conclusion of a just land claims settlement would bring about the devolution of responsibility for all Yukon land. Following the identification and protection of Yukon Indian lands, it has always been the position of this government, that land should be available to all Yukoners, both native and non-native.

Indeed, when this government was re-elected to office on June 7, this position was central to our party platform. So, as I am certain the minister will understand, it is one from which we will not back away. This position was again reiterated in the Throne Speech with which this session was opened, and I cannot believe that any party to the land claims negotiations was unaware of it.

There appears to be another major misunderstanding revealed in the Minister's address today. This misunderstanding concerns what is being negotiated in the Yukon Indian land claims forum. The Minister speaks of protecting the rights of Yukon Indian people in Yukon's political structure and process, and of setting up a tripartite process to determine what these guarantees should be. Such a process is unnecessary and, in fact, would be redundant.

Constitutional guarantees have been negotiated with respect to hunting, trapping and fishing rights, education, health care and social services, local government and land use planning. I could go on and on. The point is that there is no need for a further process and no real reason for it. The special interests of Indian people, in all aspects of our government, will be guaranteed in the land claims settlement. Therefore, there will be no need for special representation in a constitutional process.

With respect to representation in this Legislature, I ask the minister to look around him. We have in Yukon one vote for one person for one member of one legislative assembly. That is a fundamental, democratic principle not to be tampered with.

<sup>100</sup> Yukoners know that our territory is a treasure house of natural resources. These resources should be developed for the good of Yukoners and the good of all Canadians. When the current recession ends, these resources will still be there and waiting. Both governments have an obligation to see that they are developed in our mutual benefit, as the minister has reiterated to us today.

On behalf of all members of this House, I would like to thank the Minister for speaking to us. I am certain that his address will be a subject of considerable discussion in Yukon. Yukoners are not known to be shy about expressing their opinions. Once again, I thank the Minister for the good news. On those issues where we differ I am confident that we will have some meaningful discussions about them in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite you, the Minister, his delegation, the Commissioner and his party, and all MLAs to the member's lounge for coffee.

*Applause*

*All present left the Chambers at 11:45 a.m.*

