



# The Yukon Legislative Assembly

---

Number 21

3rd Session

25th Legislature

---

## **HANSARD**

**Monday, May 2, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

# Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Andy Phillipsen, 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, and 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 and Tourism/Heritage and Cultural Resources

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### (Progressive Conservative)

Bill Brewster	Kluane
Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Kathie Nukon	Old Crow
Andy Phillipsen	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

**01 Whitehorse, Yukon****Monday, May 2, 1983 — 1:30 p.m.**

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

*Prayers*

**DAILY ROUTINE****INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I would like to welcome Miss Eleanor O'Donovan's Grade Six class from Christ the King High School. The class is presently studying a unit in social studies on culture and government is one area of the study. They have also been studying government in other countries; hence the reason for coming here this afternoon. Welcome.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any documents or returns?

**TABLING OF DOCUMENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I have for tabling the answers to written questions from the hon. member for Mayo, dated April 20, 1983.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I have for tabling the criteria used for evaluating and approving agriculture applications, as well as a copy of the agreement of sale for land.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any reports of committees?  
Petitions?

**PETITIONS**

**Mr. Clerk:** I have had the honour to review a petition, being Petition No. 3 of the Third Session of the 25th Legislative Assembly, as presented by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre on April 28, 1983. This petition meets the requirements, as to form, of the Standing Orders of the Yukon Legislative Assembly.

I have also had the honour to review a petition, being Petition No. 4, as presented by the hon. member for Whitehorse South Centre on April 28, 1983. Pursuant to Standing Order 66(1) of the Yukon Legislative Assembly, it is my responsibility to report whether a petition conforms to the rules recognized by the House. This petition does not conform in the following respects: 1) It is not addressed to the Yukon Legislative Assembly, as required by Standing Order 65(1) and Appendix 2 of the Standing Orders. 2) It is not dated, as required by Appendix 2 of the Standing Orders. 3) It assumes the style of a declaration and does not specifically request any action of the Legislative Assembly, which is in violation of Annotation 670 of Beauchesne, which states "a paper assuming the style of a declaration will not be received".

**02 Hon. Mr. Tracey:** In reply to Petition Number 1, because this petition and an answer to the petition would be *sub judice*, it is not my intention to answer the petition at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further petitions?  
Introduction of bills?  
Notices of motion for the production of papers?  
Notices of motion?  
Are there any statements by ministers?

**STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** As required by Section 2 of the *Canada Student Loans Act*, I bring to the attention of this Assembly this government's intent to have an order-in-council passed that will designate Yukon College as a specified educational institution, as defined under the *Canada Student Loans Act*.

Under the act, a specified educational institute is an institution of learning that offers courses at a post-secondary school level and

which is designated as such by the Commissioner-in-Council of Yukon. Designating Yukon College under the *Canada Student Loans Act* will enable students attending the college to apply for Canada Student Loans and will also enable them, through the provisions of the *Income Tax Act* of Canada to qualify for income tax deductions for educational purposes. At the present time, students attending Yukon College are not eligible for Canada Student Loans and, other than those students enrolled in trades courses, do not qualify for income tax deductions for educational purposes.

**Mr. Byblow:** In brief response, we would commend the minister for taking this initiative, considering the benefit that it will provide to students attending Yukon College. Particularly in this recession year when many unemployed people will be taking the opportunity to upgrade their education, we certainly support this financial incentive. I trust that more of our citizens, thereby, will be encouraged to remain in Yukon to take advantage of the facilities we do have.

**03**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am pleased to announce that this week the Department of Education is hosting the 12th annual Interchange on Canadian Studies Conference. Approximately 200 grade 11 and 12 students, representing the Northwest Territories and the provinces, are presently in Whitehorse and, in conjunction with nearly 200 Yukon grade 11 and 12 students, are discussing northern issues. The theme of the conference is 'Sixty Above' and it is taking place at F. H. Collins Secondary School. Those Yukon students billeting an out-of-territory student will receive a return trip to the place of residence of the student they are hosting. I am sure you will agree that we are fortunate in being able to promote an exchange of ideas on northern issues and provide other Canadian young people an opportunity to learn more about Yukon.

**Mr. Penikett:** I rise to join in the minister's announcement by sharing her pleasure in this event. I am sure we are all pleased to welcome back our old friend Pierre Berton for this event. We are also pleased to note the participants have a very busy agenda. I would want to, in commenting on this interchange on Canadian studies, recognize the role of many local people in organizing the 1983 conference — they are obviously too numerous to be named but I think their participation should be noted by the House. I just want to close by saying from this side that we, too, would want to welcome them to Yukon and wish them well in their deliberations.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there any further statements by ministers?  
Are there any questions?

**QUESTION PERIOD****Question re: Land claims**

**Mr. Penikett:** To the government leader: the government leader has repeatedly said that his Indian land claims boycott has nothing to do with Yukon Indians and Indian land claims. In view of the fact that the continuing boycott is hurting no one but the Yukon Indians and a land claims settlement, can the government leader explain how his government's boycott puts any effective pressure on the federal government?

**04 Hon. Mr. Pearson:** There is effective pressure being put on the federal government because the federal government wants these issues cleaned up as much as we do. I believe it will be evident to the leader of the opposition, very shortly, that our so-called boycott — it has not been a boycott — as it is referred to by the leader of the opposition, is going to have proven to be beneficial to all of the people of the territory.

**Mr. Penikett:** The boycott is not only not a land claims boycott now, it is not even a boycott. Since the federal government is evidently in no way being hurt by the Yukon government's position, has the government leader considered that the boycott, or whatever you want to call it, may be losing Yukon Indians their one chance for a just land claims settlement?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I do not think that it has anything at all to do with the Yukon's chance for a just, fair and equitable land claims settlement. In fact, the reason that we are not at the table

now is because we want to ensure that it is a just, fair and equitable settlement.

**Mr. Penikett:** It would take more than one hand to count the contradictions in that statement. Since last week he said, while admitting that his government was representing non-native Yukon interests at the land claims talks, and indicating that the Yukon government had done its research on behalf of the non-beneficiaries of the Indian claim, has the government leader now put to rest, once and for all, his claim to represent all Yukoners on this particular question?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Not at all. Not by any stretch of the imagination. We, in fact, do represent all of the people of the Yukon Territory. We are the government and were duly elected by all of the people of this territory. I recognize that the leader of the opposition has a very tough time accepting that, but someday he is really going to have to accept it as a fact; he is the opposition; he is not the government. We, on this side, are the government. We are the people's representatives. We are the people's choice.

05

#### Question re: NEED program

**Mr. Byblow:** My question is to the Minister of Education.

Last week, the minister stated that she believed the Yukon government's contribution towards the NEED Program in amount of the \$75 top-up, could be applied to wages. I want to check with the minister if it is therefore the policy of this government that YTG funds be used to top-up wages in the federal government program of NEED funding?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That top-up does apply only to the private sector; it does not apply to community programs or other programs that apply for assistance.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the minister confirming that it is therefore policy of this government to allow the \$75 per week contribution by YTG not to apply to NEED projects sponsored by non-profit organizations?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is correct. The reasoning for that was, under the program, Yukon retained the option to designate where it wished to apply its contribution through the NEED Program. We exercised the option by designating the contribution to be primarily for the private sector.

The reasons for selecting that route were that, because Yukon's contribution was very small compared to the federal contribution — \$200,000, as opposed to \$1,000,000 — we could see very quickly that we would be unable to support every project. The private sector sponsors have traditionally been excluded from the other job creation projects under the Yukon/Canada Community Recovery Program, under Section 38. So, it was felt that while it was important to fund as many jobs as possible, it would be of more benefit to Yukon's economy in the long-run if we supported the private sector portion.

**Mr. Byblow:** In establishing this stipulation, did the minister or her department investigate policy in other jurisdictions of the country to see if the policy that YTG instituted conforms?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I do not know if the policy that the member is talking about is really a policy. We have a NEED Program Committee, which is made up of equal representation from the federal government and the Yukon Territorial Government with a commonly agreed upon chairman. They agreed to take this direction and we took that advice from that committee.

06

#### Question re: The Children's Act

**Mr. Kimmerly:** To the minister responsible for *The Children's Act*: in view of the public controversy that the minister became aware of subsequent to the ministerial statement on Thursday, is the department now considering introducing a green paper on children's rights in the fall session?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No. It is my intention to re-introduce *The Children's Act* at the fall session.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I am aware that the deputy minister is going to Ottawa to talk about the *Young Offenders Act*. What is the present YTG position concerning the proclamation of the federal *Young Offenders Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Our position regarding the proclamation of

the *Young Offenders Act* has not changed. We are not prepared for the promulgation of that act, and neither are a lot of provinces. We will be going down there to make our position well known to them and also to try to get the funding in order to do our share that is required under the *Young Offenders Act*. We feel that it is the federal government's responsibility to pay the additional costs for the *Young Offenders Act* and that is the reason why we are going down there.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What is the present government position concerning the proposed date for proclamation of the *Young Offenders Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I just answered that question.

#### Question re: Land claims negotiations

**Mr. Porter:** My question is for the government leader. The Yukon government's land claims negotiator was quoted recently as stating "it would certainly be misleading to say we are optimistic", referring, of course, to this government's demand for the transfer of 15 to 20 percent of land in Yukon. Does the statement by his negotiator mean that this government is prepared to compromise on the land issue and go back to the land claims table or does the negotiator's statement mean that this government will not compromise and continue its boycott of the land claims negotiations until there is total agreement on their original demands?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I was once told by a wise old man that, in fact, the art of politics is compromise.

**Mr. Porter:** A very encouraging answer. The government's negotiator was further quoted as stating that he favoured a clause in the land claims deal specifically stating that all parties want to make an exchange of aboriginal rights for other rights. What is this government's position on the entrenchment of aboriginal rights in the land claims agreement? Does this government not agree that the land claims process will, in effect, be entrenching certain specific aboriginal rights?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is very difficult for me to answer that kind of a very specific question in this form. We are not negotiating land claims in the Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Porter:** One out of two is not too bad. Earlier today, it was reported that both the federal government and the CYI have agreed to negotiate toward a one-government model on a bi-lateral basis, if necessary, regardless of the fact that this government continues to boycott the land claims negotiations. What is the government's position on this latest development?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is very difficult to react, and I am surely not going to start establishing government positions in respect to pure speculation in the media.

#### Question re: Human Rights Act

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the Minister of Justice, I will now direct it to the government leader.

Since the federal government has added a clause to the *Human Rights Act* which specifically prohibits sexual harassment, is it the position of this government that the Yukon *Fair Practices Act* requires such a specific reference to sexual harassment in order to offer equal protection?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not certain, however, I would like to advise the hon. member that it is our intention to be looking very carefully, as we have told her a number of times during the course of this session, at that particular legislation over the course of the summer and I anticipate that if we can get all of the work done then it is fairly safe to assume that it would be part of our legislative package in the fall.

**Mrs. Joe:** The government leader has answered my question, but, in view of the amendments of the federal *Human Rights Act* which excludes government employees I was just wanting to know whether he would make a commitment that that would be done in the fall?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, I am not making any commitment. I have said, on numerous occasions, to the member that we are dealing with the matter and I have learned from long and bitter experience that sometimes we cannot deal with these things as quickly, or as expeditiously, as we would like. In this particular

instance when we are dealing with what is very complicated legislation, I cannot be expected to make any sort of commitment in respect to date, other than we on this side consider ourselves to be very fair people, as well, and we would like to see that legislation, whatever is required, in place at the earliest possible date.

**Mrs. Joe:** In view of the amendments that have been passed regarding the government employees, how will those employees be protected under this government's legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** They are not covered now. It is something that we will have to deal with.

**Question re: Wages to YTG injured employees**

**Mr. McDonald:** I, too, have a question for the government leader in his capacity as minister responsible for the Public Service Commission. As the government leader is aware, the government pays employees injured at work their full salary in lieu of workers' compensation benefits. Is the government leader aware of any problems in respect to taxes payable on this workplace injury pay?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not aware of any problems. I am confident if the member has some specific issues, I, and the public service commissioner, would be most happy to hear about them. I have not been aware of any specific taxation problems in the past.

**Mr. McDonald:** As the full salary for work-related injuries is reported as regular income and taxable as regular income, has the government investigated whether any unfair advantage or disadvantage is suffered by employees not entitled to receive the untaxable workers' compensation benefits?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** A little bit of mathematics tells me very, very quickly that any employee would rather get full pay for compensable acts than compensation, notwithstanding the tax. I am confident that the member for Mayo is not doing any employee of this government any favours at all by raising this issue.

**Mr. McDonald:** I, too, know that there are working people who are not in the 25 percent income tax bracket but are in higher income tax brackets. Has the government advised all those employees who have suffered a loss of benefits as a result of this workplace injury pay in lieu of compensation policy of the tax implications of this policy?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am confident that the member opposite would advise them if he, in fact, thought there was any loss in benefits.

**Question re: Whitehorse Indian band**

**Mr. Penikett:** We seem to be acquiring a lot of new assignments over here. A question to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs: concerning the proposed relocation of the Whitehorse Indian Band to the new Hillcrest area, could the minister inform the House if his government has held or plans to hold discussions with the Band, the City of Whitehorse and the federal government upon the subject of the form of local government for the relocated Band?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** There are going to be, undoubtedly, discussions between the various parties involved. It would seem to me that it will be another part of Whitehorse, just like Porter Creek, if the member opposite is inferring that perhaps it may be different. I cannot see that happening.

**Mr. Penikett:** The minister opposite may or may not be aware, but the subject of the form of local government may yet be an issue in the land claims talks, if and when they proceed. I want to ask the minister, since the Whitehorse Indian Band relocation seems to be a more and immediate real possibility than a settlement of land claims, has this government decided, firmly and finally, its position on this issue? Is it, as the minister has decided, that it should be part of the Municipality of Whitehorse rather than as the band is now governed, by a band council?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would say the over all issue of the one government system and how it would fit in would be resolved by land claims, once discussions were to continue. The immediate situation, if they are to move there, would seem to me to be that a conscious decision would have to be made. The various services that would be provided would be provided through the City of Whitehorse and, subsequently, the laws and bylaws of the City of

Whitehorse would apply.

If the member opposite thinks it should be different, perhaps he should say so.

**Mr. Penikett:** Believe me, I am not making any representation to the minister because Mr. Speaker would not allow that. I do want to ask the minister if it is therefore his position as Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, since the issue of a one- or two-government system has not been finally resolved as he has just indicated, that the relocation of the Whitehorse Indian Band, which is governed by a band council, cannot therefore proceed until this issue is settled at land claims?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would like to think that would not be an impediment. I have had no representations made to my office. I do know that there has been one preliminary meeting at the administrative level. I would assume down the road here I will have to meet with the city fathers and the Government of Canada, as well as the band, at some time. If the decision taken some time ago is a decision that is going to promise some action, it is going to have to come through the various channels in order for us to respond.

**Question re: Yukon Hydro**

**Mr. Byblow:** Nor will I ever make a representation, Mr. Speaker.

I previously raised the question with the government leader about Yukon Hydro and he advised me that an agreement was imminent to acquire the 49 percent share interest in that company. Can the government leader advise me: what will be the direct and/or indirect cost to this government from that acquisition in dollars and cents?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sorry, I do not have those kinds of numbers available. If the member had given me notice or, I would respectfully suggest, possibly a written question, I would be able to get the answers for him.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would have hoped for a general cost, however, I will ask the government leader a more specific question: will this government be assuming a proportionate representation on the board of directors of Yukon Hydro following an acquisition?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Same answer.

**Mr. Byblow:** The government leader will have it in writing tomorrow.

Because the boards of Yukon Hydro and Yukon Electric are nearly identical, will this government be assuming any board positions on Yukon Electric?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Same answer.

**Question re: The Children's Act**

**Mr. Kimmerly:** About *The Children's Act* and its relationship to the *Young Offenders Act*, the most recent government position on the proclamation of the *Young Offenders Act* was that there was a deadline of October 1st. The minister tells us today that that is not changed, even though the government...

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that that date had changed.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no point of order.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Are there negotiations underway or contemplated concerning a new date for the proclamation of the *Young Offenders Act*?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No. I did not say that October 1 was not the new date. I said that we have always maintained that we want it put off. I did not say that it was going to be put off. As far as I know, to this date, October 1 is the date the *Young Offenders Act* will be proclaimed and we will try our best to meet that deadline, even taking into consideration that we have to pass this bill in order to do it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Concerning the compatibility of the diversion plan in *The Children's Act* with the *Young Offenders Act*, will the deputy minister, on the current trip, be seeking the federal government's position with regard to compatibility of the two acts?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No. We will be down there discussing finances, in the main.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is the minister aware that the federal position is that the two acts are probably not compatible concerning the diversion plan?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know whose position it is. I suspect that it is the member's across the floor. We are fairly confident that they are compatible and we have done one year's work to produce that act. We are confident that it is compatible.

**Question re: Teslin administration building**

**Mr. Porter:** My question is for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. On April 24 of this year, the LID in Teslin wrote to the minister and requested that the government consider the community of Teslin as the next community to receive an administrative building. Has the minister replied and, if so, what has been his response?

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** There have been a number of requests from various communities regarding administration buildings. They will all be considered and, if any decisions are taken in that direction, it will be reflected in the capital budget this forthcoming year.

**Mr. Porter:** Will the Teslin LID's request for an administration building be considered a priority in the determination of next year's capital budget?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member asking a question or making a representation?

**Mr. Porter:** Asking a question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Proceed.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** It will be given serious consideration, just like any request.

**Mr. Porter:** In his discussions with federal officials on capital expenditures as outlined in the federal budget, would the minister undertake to propose constructing an administrative building in Teslin as an issue that is supported by this government and should be considered a priority in the federal budget as it relates to capital expenditures?

**Speaker's Ruling**

**Mr. Speaker:** I would rule that question out of order as being a representation.

**Question re: Women's Bureau**

**Mrs. Joe:** I have a question for the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau. Will the minister responsible for the Women's Bureau be here tomorrow?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** It is not possible for ministers to be here every day. The member has made the point that the Minister of Justice is not in the House today. She really only has to make it once and it is not necessary that I, or anyone else, answer for where they are. If the Minister of Justice is able to be in the House tomorrow, he will be here. In the meantime, she is quite free to ask questions of anyone whom she wishes.

**Mrs. Joe:** I was just asking a simple question and I did not realize that I was going to be chastised for it. I will then direct this question to the government leader. I hope that he can answer it.

I understand that the most recent government policy on labour standards does not include a number of important recommendations made by the Yukon Status of Women. Could copies of those recommendations be made available to us?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure that I follow the question. Maybe that is the reason that she wanted to ask it of the Minister of Justice. If members opposite would like to have information from departments of this government, there is a procedure that we have in place; they sit down and talk to the minister. Most times the minister is able to say to them, "Go to the department and get the information that you need". It is not necessary that the member waste or use up the time of the House to seek this kind of information. If it is departmental information, it is not available in Question Period. We have to go to the department and get it in any event.

**Mrs. Joe:** I just want to say that I am going to be asking the rest of my questions to the minister tomorrow, if he is here.

**Question re: UIC payments for members of the Legislature**

**Mr. McDonald:** I have a question for the government leader. During the last Legislature, members were told that they were eligible to contribute and receive UIC payments. Can the government leader advise the House as to the reasons for the federal

government's reversal of that policy this spring?

**Mr. Speaker:** That question would be out of order in that it seeks an opinion of the federal government. As I hear the question I think one would have to refer that to the federal government.

**Mr. Penikett:** On a point of order. It is a question of information which the Minister of Finance would have in his capacity since it, in fact, relates to negotiations and some communications that will have gone on between the federal government and this government, I have no doubt.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps that is what is being sought, but that is not the way the question was phrased. If the hon. member would care to rephrase his question perhaps the government could answer the question.

**Mr. McDonald:** During the last Legislature, members were told that they were eligible to contribute and receive UIC payments. Can the government leader inform the House whether he has received communications from the federal government as to the reasons for the reversal of this policy this spring?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I regret to advise the House that we have not received any reasons as to why this thing has been changed, but it has been changed and it is all across Canada. MLAs are no longer eligible to receive UIC payments given that they are not re-elected. It is an interpretation of the act that has just come down. We have been advised of it and, as a consequence, we can no longer properly take deductions from MLAs with respect to their UIC payments.

**Mr. McDonald:** Can the government leader confirm, even though MLAs laid off after the last election were eligible for unemployment insurance, whether MLAs will be entitled to pay into and to receive some temporary income insurance in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** No, not through UIC. It is my understanding that MLAs are not eligible and, as a consequence, I guess you could pay but you are not going to get any benefits.

**Mr. McDonald:** One last question: given that members of long standing, including Mr. Speaker himself, have no income insurance or retirement benefits, what is the position of this government with respect to pensions for Yukon legislators?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** This Legislature is the only one in Canada — I believe the last one to go into place was in 1971 — the only Legislature in Canada that does not have a pension plan for MLAs when they either retire or are defeated. It is a concern of mine, personally, and has been for some considerable length of time; in fact, since I was first elected. It is an issue that has been referred by this government to the Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges and, at the present time, I am in the process of trying to make a determination whether or not it would be advantageous and politic to ask for this referral to go to the Rules, Elections and Privileges Committee once again.

**Mr. Speaker:** There being no further questions, we will proceed to the Order Paper, under Orders of the Day.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

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

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

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will recess until 2:25 p.m.

**Recess**

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

**Bill No. 5: Second Appropriation Act, 1983-82 — continued**

**On Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have quite a lengthy introductory statement to make and, hopefully, it will answer all the questions of the

opposition before they have even asked them.

I am pleased to introduce the second budget for the new Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources. There have been many accomplishments over the past few months.

The advent of the nine-day fortnight had the effect of reducing the number of hours for public access to the department, but the quality of service was maintained. However, it was particularly gratifying to see specific accomplishments, some of which were long out-standing problems. I refer particularly to the foundation work on the old Territorial Administration Building — the Dawson Museum — further preservation work along the Yukon River and the renovations to Centennial Hall in Dawson City. This work, in addition to creating employment, assisted in preserving our heritage and, very importantly, will provide improved tourist attractions.

In addition to Centennial Hall, the 1983 tourist season will be enriched through the Canada/Yukon Tourism Agreement by new visitor information centres in Watson Lake, Dawson and Carcross. These centres are attractions in their own right, each centre having a special theme and appropriate interpretive materials, including pamphlets and slide presentations.

The 1983-84 operations and maintenance budget is the budget that will build on the plans and work that has been done during the past few years. Presently, there are a total of 16 major planning projects underway. Several of the more important planning documents being worked on are:

1) the wilderness adventure tourism study. This study provides an over-view of the industry and a development and marketing strategy. It identifies some of the key issues to be dealt with by the industry and government. The study has a joint industry-government undertaking. The report is now being circulated to all industry representatives and the public-at-large for reaction. An overall strategy should be finalized by this summer. This planning document is long overdue.

2) Various regional planning documents are in the process: the Dawson tourism plan, the Kluane regional tourism plan, the Southern Lakes/Carcross plan and the Watson Lake tourism plan. Each of the above planning documents had to begin with an inventory or a status report. In the case of the Dawson plan, it should be noted that it has to develop with a new municipal community plan. The work involves a public steering committee guiding the consultants who are doing the actual work. To date, a plan has been drafted and the finished product should be ready by the end of May. After that, public meetings will be held before the plan is ready for consideration for official sanction by the City of Dawson and by the Department of Tourism.

3) The Kluane tourism plan has reached the stage where public hearings have been announced. A newsletter has been circulated to keep interested persons updated. Once the public input has been reviewed, the report will be finalized.

The Southern Lakes-Carcross and the Watson Lake tourism plans are both at the initial stages, with steering committees from each region having been formed. Data is being gathered and workshops will commence in the near future. The complete process to a final report should take until this fall.

There are other regional plans to be developed: the Campbell Corridor and the Dempster Highway, for examples. Once these plans have been completed, a long-term tourism development strategy for the entire territory can be developed; these remaining components being priority elements of the new tourism agreement.

As can be seen, planning in an industry as complex as the tourism industry is very exacting. Consultations with all segments of the industry as well as the public-at-large must be undertaken. There is a whole host of interest groups that also want to provide input. The efforts of the planning and development staff to date have been commendable. In addition, to translate the planning documents into development strategies necessitates private sector initiatives. The government's role in development is to show, through the planning exercise, the potential for certain types of development or attractions on the long and short term and then, if necessary, to provide financial incentives in order to entice the private sector to invest.

Our small tax base does not provide the revenue to set up a special tourism business development fund. Yukon Territorial

Government, in concert with the Government of Canada, is very close to providing a vehicle for the continuation of development of funds as was provided under the previous agreement. Much of the planning has now been done. It is hoped that very shortly the final component will be put into place.

With planning and development within the tourism industry progressing, marketing must continue to take place. Again, there is a differentiation of roles between government and industry. In cooperation with the industry, marketing funds are targeted to attract people to Yukon. The private sector, as was mentioned before, must essentially take the responsibility from that point and provide the accommodation and the attractions to hold the tourist, with or without government assistance.

Before I delve into the marketing initiatives, I must stress that these initiatives are designed in cooperation with the industry. However, data is provided to the cooperative marketing council through various research and planning projects of the department. The previously described planning exercises are for development on a long term basis; that is, five to eight years. In addition, various other studies are undertaken to evaluate the ongoing efforts of the tourism branches. Specifically, conversion studies are designed to ascertain what portion of the requests for Yukon travel information actually come to Yukon; it is very important information for determining future marketing efforts. Also, statistics are compiled at the visitor reception centres to determine such information as the visitor's length of stay, origin, type of accommodation used, mode of transportation, et cetera.

4) This has been very useful information to assist in targeting our marketing funds.

In the past year, one of our marketing efforts was the continued participation in the State of Alaska marketing program. Our two page advertisements in the Alaska literature has, so far, brought in over 20,000 responses. In Canada we also participated with Alaska in a \$200,000 campaign on both TV and in magazines. Yukon advertisements appeared in *Time*, *Maclean's* and *Reader's Digest*, and have, to date, yielded just over 17,000 responses. Other significant marketing efforts include members of the Yukon Visitors Association attending consumer shows in San Francisco, Toronto, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. Mr. Redfern, executive director of the Yukon Visitors Association, took the Arizona Charlie Meadows show to recreational vehicle parks in southern California and Arizona. To date, these consumer promotions yielded a further 16,828 inquiries.

During the past season, Tourism Yukon hosted a total of 207 retail travel agents, 15 tour wholesalers and 42 writers of film crews. These visitors came from other parts of Canada, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Holland, Sweden, Australia, South Africa and Austria.

In the field of overseas market development, a Tourism Yukon official met with Japanese tour operators while in that country on leave. Another official attended the world travel market in London and the international tourism exchange in Berlin as a member of the Canada West team. A member of the Yukon Visitors Association staff took part in travel trade seminars in Australia and New Zealand. The 1983, Yukon Travel Guide and travel agents manual were both published before November 1982, considerably ahead of other provinces. We have received congratulations on our literature from afar. In order to get the literature into the hands of those who inquire for information we are now processing all inquiries through the government computer which gives us the capability of producing statistics and analyses, as well as labels.

We continue to participate with Alberta, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories departments of tourism in Canada West. This marketing consortium has, up until now, operated in Europe, and last year we participated in a \$156,000 marketing programs to the travel trade and consumer in Europe at a cost to Yukon of \$22,000. This year, the program will be expanded to include the Pacific Rim which is perceived as a major emerging market for Canada. Tourism Yukon staff have participated in promotions to travel agents in Ontario and western Canada as well as in the Pacific Northwest United States. Atlas Tours personnel represented Yukon, as well as their company, in similar promotions elsewhere in the

United States. Also, it should be noted that the marketing plan provides for assistance to private operators. A program introduced during the past year, upon the advice of the Yukon Cooperative Marketing Committee, was one of financial assistance to Yukon operators for marketing. Four grants totalling nearly \$13,000 were made in the past year to assist the private operators in marketing their products.

<sup>16</sup> In this new fiscal year, the cooperative marketing committee will be examining the various components of the present marketing plan in an endeavour to evaluate our past performance. In addition, new projects will be looked at in order to assess their potential for promoting travel to Yukon. One such new program will be the production of a number of short one-minute TV vignettes on Yukon for use by TV stations in Canada, initially, and eventually elsewhere. For the cost of production, which is estimated at \$100,000, we hope to receive over \$2,000,000 worth of exposure if the space had to be purchased as advertising.

Work will also commence this year on the production of a tourist promotion film for which funds were allocated in the capital budget. We shall continue to develop new and emerging markets as we are able, as well as making sure that our existing markets are not neglected. It is extremely difficult to evaluate our tourism efforts without looking at the national and international scene. Forecasters predict great things for world tourism. On a world scale, \$500,000,000 will be generated, and it will by far be the world's largest industry by the year 2000. Canada will also see an increase in its share of this total.

Easier times have hidden some of the problems in Canada that have resulted in a decrease in the number of foreign visitors. As a nation, our problems in tourism are not just a result of the recession but have been around for a long time and are reflected in our loss of market share and a growing travel deficit.

For example, if Canada had maintained its share of world tourism in 1981, as it had enjoyed in 1973, an additional \$1,700,000,000 in receipts would have been injected into our economy. In practical terms, that means 113,000 jobs that are now sorely needed do not exist. There would not have been a \$1,100,000,000 travel deficit. We would have registered a \$600,000,000 surplus. There would have been an additional \$750,000,000 in taxes and \$250,000,000 more in potential reinvestment income.

This has occurred basically because there has been a decline in United States visitors and an increased number of Canadians travelling out of Canada. If current trends continue, the picture worsens. How has Yukon fared in this softening market? In 1982, Yukon registered its second highest year ever; 1981 was a record year and in 1982 we experienced a modest decline and had 365,000 visitors. Over the course of the last several years, the proportion of American visitors in Yukon had declined as a percentage of total visitors from 1978, which registered a high of 71 percent. In 1983, 63 percent of our visitors were American. In 1982, that percentage, once again, went up to 67 percent. This is a reversal of the trend that the rest of Canada is experiencing. The marketing efforts over the last few years must be paying off. I would just indicate that the trend has been, for the rest of Canada, a decline of American visitors in some areas of up to 20 percent.

<sup>17</sup> It is encouraging to announce that, to date, there has been an increase in the number of requests for information over the last year; an increase of 44 percent. If past indicators are any criteria, the 1983 season should be at least as good as 1982, and possibly as good as 1981.

I will be most pleased to respond to questions or elaborate on any issues as we proceed through the program-by-program debates. Thank you.

**Mr. Byblow:** Firstly, I want to say that I am very pleased with the minister's opening remarks. They are very informative and quite comprehensive. The minister and her deputy are to be commended.

I believe the minister heard from this side, at some length during last budget debate in November or December, respecting some of the main concerns that we felt were facing the tourism industry. I think that rather than make a lengthy response, I would like to pick up on a couple of those concerns, address them one by one and, perhaps, through a question and answer format, we could get the

general debate out of the way.

The minister spent considerable time talking about development and I was pleased about that because this is something that I raised with the minister on numerous occasions. The question arises from trying to adopt a tourism strategy that maintains a balance between development and marketing. I believe the minister understands that there is no criticism intended of the marketing plans or program of the Yukon government, in cooperation with industry. As the minister detailed in the closing remarks of her statement — and I will probably want to ask some questions about that — if we are seeing a reversal of a pattern that is taking place elsewhere in the country, then, certainly, our marketing is paying off.

Back to the original question respecting development; this inter-relates, to a large extent, with the new agreement that the minister has been negotiating with Canada. I recognize from the minister's previous answers to questions that the negotiations, though complete, cannot be announced in any great detail. I suppose I am curious whether the subtlety of the minister's address by outlining the 16 major plans, in part, encompass the proposal that this government put forth in the negotiation of that agreement.

To a large extent, the minister indicated that there were many plans on-going. She made reference to, I believe, the Watson Lake area, the Kluane area, the Southern Lakes/Carcross area, as areas that are being investigated for tourism potential and development. I just want to talk about that development for a moment and raise a question with the minister about what we are really doing to advance the case of development in tourism?

I assume that a large part of it will be taken up through programs put in place under the new sub-agreement that is being negotiated. I recall vividly the tourism conference last summer, where the development aspect was talked about at great length and, in the summary of the conference, that the minister's department provided, in detail, those development concerns relating to keeping the tourist here. It is one thing to market a product; it is a second thing to have a product to sell. The product was what was being raised as an area that required further work.

<sup>18</sup> It could relate to the development of wilderness travel areas; it could relate to the development of more elaborate or even more remote campgrounds that are accessible; it could relate to boat and docking facilities; it could relate to historical sites development, and protection at the same time. There was a tremendous amount of development talk in that conference, and one of the emphases that I recall, and certainly I have raised this with the minister repeatedly, is that we have to direct that development beyond a single corridor concept. That has been the case to date and I do not say that necessarily in a critical way; I say it is what was done with the available dollars. My colleague from Mayo has raised it with the minister respecting the potential of that historic area. I have raised with the minister the Campbell corridor, which, again, has a tremendous historicity relating to the early 1840s and the first entrance of the white man to Yukon.

What are we really doing with respect to development, in a physical sense? The minister says there is no money for a tourism development fund — something that has been promoted, certainly by my party, and by others — as a source of funding for industry to take advantage of and perhaps, in a joint venture type of way, to actually engage in those kind of developments that we are talking about. Perhaps I have talked enough on that one major concern. Perhaps the minister could respond in some fashion to the question of how are we attacking the development side in preparation of a long-term tourism strategy?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The response could require quite a lengthy answer, so I will try to be logical and address the reply in a chronological manner. First of all, I think the initiative of the government to have created the new department, Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources, has indicated that we have recognized the extremely important role that heritage and cultural resources play in the tourism industry. We can address, like the member for Mayo who has asked, some history or heritage aspect that should be preserved. I think that is the first point I would like to make. We have made that identification so that we will preserve heritage in concert with tourism. We realize that tourists come to Yukon



because of the magnificent history, because of the gold rush days, and we also recognize that we have a lot of valuable attractions in Yukon that must not be allowed to deteriorate.

We would then progress to the Canada-Yukon tourism agreement. The last agreement was more specific than, perhaps, this one is going to be, and I cannot say that that is for sure because we do not know if it will be totally accepted by the Government of Canada. However, that is the approach we have taken. The other agreement was more specifically for destination communities, such as Dawson City. We are hoping to be able to elaborate on that a bit and look at the whole Yukon Territory and look at the individual entrepreneur. We will look at the industry aspect of it, and I think this government has indicated that they recognize that, in order for tourism to develop and expand and for agriculture to develop and expand, there is going to have to be certain government monies available and certain government initiatives taken to encourage this. <sup>19</sup> We have explored the idea of small business loans and the member was a member of the Legislative Assembly when that was being discussed, so I do not have to elaborate any further. We still hope for that kind of an endeavour.

I would just like to indicate that there is a balance between development and marketing. I think it is very difficult to sound technical about it and not hard and cruel. We do process, I believe they say, 365,000 tourists in 110 days in Yukon, which is shop talk. We do have a lot of things for the tourists to see when they are in Whitehorse and other communities in the Yukon. It is very difficult to balance marketing and development. The member is aware that we have to get the numbers of visitors to the territory. We have been working very diligently doing that.

We also have to embark on some endeavours with our natural resources here and that is the people of Yukon; the private sector, the civil service — all of the people of Yukon. We have identified some funds for a local advertising campaign to help the public of Yukon recognize the extreme importance of tourism to their future and their future economic development; to give them some facts so that they are aware of how important the industry is to the livelihood of the Yukon. It is, of course, Yukon's number one industry now that the mining business seems to be on the downturn.

With these initiatives, we will be able to encourage people to invest. We do not have a lot of big investors in the territory but, as I was explaining, through some government assistance we may be able to encourage more. In order for people to invest, they have to be guaranteed that people will come to Yukon. I am not quite sure where that balance is between development and marketing. I think, through the department, the Yukon Visitors Association and the joint cooperative marketing committee, we are on the right track.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would certainly not disagree with the minister that we have in place an enviable marketing strategy and program. It certainly has demonstrated its rewards. I would like to say to the minister that we entertain — we welcome and we cater to — 300 and some thousand tourists; we do not process them. Extending the subject matter, the minister essentially said that this government has taken a very positive attitude towards encouragement of tourism development facilities in Yukon. I was hoping for something a little harder than that; something a little more concrete. I suppose, indirectly she said that it was being addressed in the Canada-Yukon tourism agreement.

I note that in the tourism conference coming up in Dawson later this month, that tourism development is intended for discussion at one point in the agenda. Having that taking place, I am curious to what extent details of the agreement are going to be released from a development point of view. If I am reading what this government has been advised to do, recommended to do and should have done, it is to put in place those kind of programs that would encourage the kind of tourism development facilities territory-wide, as opposed to the single corridor concept.

The minister made reference to the downturn of the mining industry and certainly that places so much more of a priority on tourism for any kind of economic maintenance in the territory now and potential for growth.

<sup>20</sup> Could I ask one more question on the subject of development and related directly to the agreement? Will the agreement contain in it

incentive money for tourism development facilities? I leave that open enough for just a broad general answer without a need to reveal detail.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I see the member has found the term "processes" as intriguing as I did and I just wanted to try it out on him.

The conference in Dawson is going to be taking place in two weeks. I believe it is the 14 and 15 of May. The federal minister responsible for tourism will be here, the hon. William Rompkey. I think, as far as discussing development at the conference, I am sure he will have some information to give to us, and I am sure we will be discussing our agreement when he is here as well. I have already made a statement that we are going to try to encourage development. We have requested development be broad and cover all of Yukon. I really do not think I can elaborate on it any more than that or I would be revealing the more particular terms of the agreement that we presented to the Government of Canada. It is unfortunate that I cannot give the member more information at this time, however, after the conference in two weeks, I am sure I will be able to supply him with further information.

**Mr. Byblow:** I will leave the question of development. I think the minister and I have spent hours on this subject and we will see what the agreement brings from the direction given to this government, from industry and individuals.

I will extend from the development question to several much more specific areas. One of the close cooperation exercises that this government is engaging in, along with the local industry — that is, referring to the YVA — is a relationship that exists with Alaska. There is a joint marketing council — the minister made reference to, I believe at some point, a \$200,000 advertising campaign — and I would be curious what the Yukon's share of that advertising was because, as I understand, Yukon got a pretty good deal. More specifically, my question relates to the railroad closure and the exchange of traffic from the coast inland to Yukon. What are we looking at in terms of accommodating those numbers who dock at Haines or Skagway, and wish to travel through Yukon. I realize we have Westours on the road. I would be curious if that is now in place for the rest of the season, and should that train not run next year, are we looking after that artery of access to the territory.

Perhaps the minister could respond in a general way, relating to the railroad and relating to the joint marketing exercise between Alaska and Yukon. I raise that as a result of a concern that came to light when the delegation from Alaska visited us a few weeks ago and it was brought up that tourism promotion by the state was going to be cut, or there were those proponents who wished to see it cut. Given the very key relationship that we have for tourism promotion with Alaska, I would like to hear from the minister, what discussions have taken place and how we are addressing that problem.

<sup>21</sup> **Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yukon's contribution is \$200,000. It used to be \$150,000 in past years, I believe. With the change in the value of the Canadian dollar and so on it has gone up to \$200,000. It probably encompasses costs that I could not put a figure on; it is a very broad advertising program and we are indeed very fortunate to be able to embark on this joint venture.

In regards to the Alaska budget, I was in some discussion with the legislators when they were here and indicated to them my willingness to give them support when the time came and the amount of money was going to be identified for the Alaska budget, because there was concern that it was going to be cut fairly drastically. I have since heard from them. However, I have not had a request for a letter of support and they were unable to give me, at that time, the exact figure. So we are keeping in touch with the Alaska legislators regarding that, and we have indicated to them we are prepared to give them support in the form of a letter indicating how important Alaska tourism is to Yukon.

On the busing/motor coach situation and the closure of White Pass, Westours and Atlas Travel Tours have applied for temporary motor coach carrying permits and they have indicated to me that they will be capable of accommodating the passengers who will be coming off the cruise ships. Of course, as soon as we heard of the closure of the White Pass, I had the department get in touch with

the Yukon Visitors Association immediately; we had a meeting the very next day, I think, and the wheels went into motion, so to speak, right away with the tour companies. And we did advance, through my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Transport and Public Utilities Board meetings so that they could make application in the event they had to purchase more motor coaches. I think it indicated to me the very quick response that came from the government and from the private sector, and indicated to me the great cooperation we have in assessing an emergency of this kind and in dealing with it. We hope that this will work out to our advantage. We will notice, in areas like Carcross, the motor coach will be able to stop. This was a place where the train had not stopped in the past. The private sector in Carcross has also embarked on a tourism promotional endeavour and are planning to have some activities in Carcross for the tourists. I think it indicates how quickly everyone responded to the situation and I think it will be to the benefit of Yukon for now.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister raised a reference to Carcross and I have had questions raised to me about the activities going on there this summer. Could the minister give me more detail respecting the upgrading of the facility — I forget the exact term — where the show is going to be going that is taking place this summer? I understand that there were tourism dollars allocated for the upgrading of a warehouse facility on the dock, at the Narrows, and that there is some elaborate facility going into construction, through private enterprise but with some tourism assistance dollars from this government. I have received various questions and I have not been able to procure any information; perhaps the minister has some.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I do not know if any of the plans have changed, so the statements I may be making may have some inaccuracies if the private entrepreneur has made some changes in his plan. I will give the member the basic understanding of what I have of what was been happening in Carcross and I can be more specific about details that the government is involved in.

The owner of the Watson General Store was successful in obtaining a lease on the White Pass Railway Station, where they plan to have some activities for the tourists in the event that they would be travelling on a motor coach and able to stop in Carcross. We gave them some assistance with the printing of a pamphlet and we also gave them some assistance through monies that were left over from the past agreement. I think the amount totalled about \$20,000 and was federal funding applied through the Government of Yukon through the last remains of the Canada/Yukon Tourism Agreement. That will facilitate him putting on a show and doing some renovations. I understand they were planning to have a wildlife display. There is someone interested in putting on a luncheon, thus creating a tourism attraction in the community of Carcross.

This endeavour enables the individual and his wife to employ, I believe, about five or six local people in Carcross. I believe they were involving the native community, as well, with an opportunity to sell some of their products if they were so interested. I thought it was a very positive step and certainly we commend the people in Carcross for the initiative they have taken.

**Mr. Byblow:** At the same time, I understand that the owner of the Caribou Hotel was seeking some tourism dollars for some restoration and upgrading of his facility. Can the minister advise me at this time whether or not that private entrepreneur was also successful in acquiring some funding under the tourism agreement?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Both owners of the Watson General Store and the Caribou Hotel received funding last year for painting. It was at that time that the owner of the Caribou Hotel had also requested funding for some foundation work to his hotel. We did not have funds for that and he was not eligible under the guidelines of the agreement for foundation work.

This amount of money that was granted to the owner of the Watson General Store was found, actually, by the federal government for us. It was an emergency situation where the project either went or it did not go and I understand that the owner of the Watson Store has also committed more than the amount of money that he had given to him.

**Mr. Byblow:** If I understand the minister correctly, with

respect to those two facilities in that community, one facility that is presently preparing for a season of catering to tourism has received something in the order of \$20,000. Is that about what the Caribou Hotel received? I just would want the minister to clarify the amounts.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, I am indicating to the member that that happened last year. The two entrepreneurs received funding last year for painting and for the facade. This year, the only application I was aware of for assistance was from the Watson General Store people.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister made reference to one of the facilities taking advantage of native crafts and I want to expand on that subject for a minute. I understand that the native community is holding a special tourism conference later in June. As I recollect, the debate surrounding native crafts, native culture and native arts during the tourism conference last July, was another area that the tourism industry could take more advantage of. Certainly the minister is familiar with other areas of the country — Alaska and the States — where native cultures have become a large part of the tourism industry.

I would like to hear from the minister what encouragement we are giving to develop that, hand-in-hand with the native community who have been soliciting assistance in developing their crafts, their culture in the form of dance and their general development of that rich history that we are really not taking advantage of.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The messages I am giving the member for Faro, about the involvement of the native people in the Carcross endeavour, is just what was passed on to me by that private entrepreneur. He was indicating to me, at that time, what his plans were. I have not gotten back to him and asked him if that, in fact, is going to be happening. That is between him and the native people of Carcross. He had indicated to me that there was some interest on their behalf.

I do not think that we can make the native people participate. They have shown and indicated to us now that they are very interested in this. They want to have a tourism conference of their own and although we were not able to give them any large financial assistance for this conference, we were able to pay for the location where they are going to hold the conference. We are giving them some personnel assistance and some audio visual equipment for the day they are going to have their conference. They did indicate a willingness to discuss it with us. I understand there is a new person at CYI, Mrs. Betsy Jackson, who has been hired to do some work for the native people in tourism. I have tried to get in touch with Mrs. Jackson, however, she was unavailable. I will be pursuing that further.

**Mr. Byblow:** I want to raise two — perhaps, in some circles, minor — items brought to my attention. The minister may choose to respond or not. In the rural areas, the small communities around the territory, there is a lack of information respecting available tourism incentive assistance literature. That is not a criticism; it is a recommendation. We could go to a small community, such as Mayo, for example, where it is not common and public knowledge what available assistance there is to the industry by members of the public or business through this government. Certainly, as it was put to me, "tourism people never come to our community". If the minister would just take that as a recommendation of advancing, either directly through her department or perhaps in the cooperative exercise that is taking place with YVA, certainly that can be advanced.

The other criticism, if you want to call it that, relates to the tourism packages that have been put out by this government. I heard this in several communities, and from a number of individuals; there was some annoyance at the lack of a map of Yukon in the package. It was also brought to my attention that even in the 1983 travel guide there is not one single map of the territory in any large format other than a tiny outline in a corner of a page designating a particular community. It seems that our tourists, and our public, is telling us that they want more geographic information. With those two observations, I will leave the minister to respond.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am aware of what the member is saying about the smaller communities and I am sure he is talking about the

very small communities in this case. I believe the larger communities do get a fair amount of information, probably because they do have people coming in who are in touch with, or do belong to, the YVA. However the concern is duly noted and I think the department is addressing this. A good example of this is that we are printing pamphlets for small communities like Carcross. I believe we are making pamphlets for other smaller areas. We also have identified money for a publishing fund in order to give some of the communities assistance in publishing their local histories. That will add to the attraction to the tourists.

As for the map in the package, I believe, — and I am not stating this as fact — that there was some discussion about this last time and when I first assumed the portfolio for Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources that YVA, in conjunction with the government, have discussed having a map. It was a fairly expensive endeavour and due to the cost and the benefit that would be accrued from having the map there they decided not to have a map. I just would like to indicate to the member that I will pursue it again if he feels it is a valid point.

**Mr. Byblow:** I certainly think that the minister's offer is well taken. It ought to be pursued. I do not know what the cost amounts to, but it is probably in the range of \$.50 to \$1 per map. I do not know what volume we would be going through but if the industry and the public are telling us that it is a handicap and an attitudinal response not to have it then it ought to be re-examined.

The minister made reference to Yukon Operators Marketing Grants and that there were four of them. This is something new that I was not aware of. I would be very curious as to the parameters of these grants, to whom they would be given and what is the future prospect of their continuation? I am very unclear as to this incentive.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This is called an operator's assistance program and I understand the idea was originally proposed several years ago. However, the funding was first allocated by the Yukon Tourism Cooperative Marketing Committee in 1982-83. The committee set the guidelines for the program and a selection committee was formed. They have a chairman and two other members; one, who is seconded to the Yukon Visitors Association, and a department member. They met and reviewed applications; there was a total of eight applications and four were granted. I believe the total amount was close to \$13,000.

**Mr. Byblow:** What was the funding able to be used for?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It enables the operators to market their product. It gives them some assistance.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have a couple of questions relating to marketing. I would like to first ask the minister if the composition of the marketing council is the same this year in positions as it was last year?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the frequency of meeting the same?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, I believe so.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister made reference to a series of studies that were being done through the marketing council and through the marketing funds. She made reference to areas of the globe that were being marketed for attracting people to or through Yukon. My question is: what is the relationship between the marketing council on which this government sits jointly with YTG and the Alaskan cooperative marketing relationship?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have members who sit on the Alaska Cooperative Marketing Council.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister is telling me that members from the Yukon marketing council — if I can use that abbreviated form, members from the Yukon council — sit on the Alaskan council? It is not a complete blend of the entire Yukon council joined with the Alaskan marketing council?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It would not be a council anymore; it would be a convention.

I believe there is joint participation. We have someone from the Alaska marketing council on ours and we have someone on theirs. I think there is a YVA representative and a government representative.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister went on at some length in her

closing remarks about the change in pattern of Yukon tourism volume and the national tourism volume. She attributed this to a decline in American tourists visiting the country and an increase in Canadian tourists leaving the country, as opposed to staying within the country.

I am very curious about that argument. If our primary market is an American market and there is a decline in the American market to Canada, how can that be a rationale for our steady growth, as it were, and the country's decline?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I would only be speculating as to why American tourists are not travelling to the rest of Canada as much as they are travelling to Yukon. It would only be my personal opinion that perhaps the American people do not feel as welcome in the rest of Canada or that there is some change in the relationship between Americans and Canadians, perhaps because of the latest endeavours of the federal government with FIRA and the National Energy Program and so on, but that would only be speculation on my part. What I do know for a fact is that these are statistics we get from the Canada government office of tourism and, as far back as last August, we were discussing this fact at the ministers' tourism conference. We are still enjoying an increase in American visitors, particularly from the three pacific coast states of California, Oregon and Washington, and part of that, I believe, is our good relationship with Seattle; that was why I felt it very necessary that I make that promotional trip to Seattle to the event that promoted Canada and Yukon.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am sure it is our pristine environment and clean air, water and paved highways that are luring the tourists here and not to Alberta. One topic that is a perpetual topic with every tourism minister over the past five years, and this tourism minister shall be no exception, is the Campbell Highway corridor. The minister knows my thoughts about the value of some development on that corridor towards tourism development, particularly for its wilderness and historic appeal. Could I put the question this way: will the new Canada/Yukon agreement provide opportunity for development of that corridor?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It is a possibility, but I cannot say for sure at this time.

**Mrs. Joe:** I just want to talk a little bit to the minister about the culture and heritage section of this department. I know we have gone on in Question Period trying to get information in regard to new legislation for culture and heritage resources and, during the last debate in the fall, the minister indicated that there was a policy paper on culture and heritage, and that she had read it and was studying it. At the same time, she had mentioned we were lacking in protection for our culture and heritage in the Yukon. Since we have not had any kind of legislation except *The Cemeteries and Burial Sites Act*, I would like to know how soon we can expect to have something in place? I am looking at having a green paper such as the recreation one or labour standards, or whatever. We already have that legislation, but we do not have any whatsoever to protect our heritage in the Yukon.

I am very concerned, as are all Yukoners. I know of cases where, many years ago, Indian villages have had to make a complete move from where they were at that time into an area beside the Alaska Highway in order to go to school where they were only able to take what they could carry at that time and for many years a lot of the things that they had left behind had been left untouched, until the last few years. There are cases now where people are going in and absolutely taking everything that is there, and people are going back many years later hoping that some of those things would still be left. Not only in regard to those sites, but those such as in Riverdale here — which, as mentioned, has been protected — and there are a number all over the Yukon where I understand there are going to be archaeological digs done in two or three locations, could the minister indicate to us how soon we can expect some progress on the policy paper that is now being distributed within the government departments, and how soon we can have some input into that or even know when anything new is going to take place other than the consultation among different departments?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have a lengthy introductory statement I would like to make when we get to the heritage portion of the

budget, if the member would like to ask me questions after I make that statement. There have been a lot of things going on in the heritage branch. However, I will answer the specific questions that she has addressed to me at this time.

We have some federal legislation and territorial legislation, of course. We also issue the archaeological permits. It is not like we do not have any control over it; however that is no consolation for the fact that we do not have heritage legislation. It is being examined in the departments by the deputy ministers right now. I want to indicate to the member, because perhaps I have not mentioned it before, that we are doing it in consultation with the Department of Renewable Resources because there is some overlap with my colleague's department in the area of parks and so on.

The Yukon Historical Museum Association is going to be having a meeting this weekend in Carmacks and I will be attending that meeting, as well as the Minister of Renewable Resources. We may, at that time, decide to introduce our policy paper. I am not quite sure about that though. It depends on the outcome of the internal meetings and depending on how much further work we have to do on it. I do want to indicate to the member that I am a bit reluctant to rush into any legislation. I do want input from the hon. members in the opposition and from the public and from very concerned people like the Historical Museums Association. I would not like to make a commitment that it would be ready for the next sitting of the Legislative Assembly; however, I do not anticipate that it is going to take much longer.

**Mrs. Joe:** Last session, I had also mentioned the Indian graveyards along the highway and the one in town that are still being visited by tourists; they are already starting again this year. We had mentioned that all of the advertising that the government had done had been stopped and, in fact, I believe it has been. However, it is still taking place and, in light of the information that the minister had mentioned with regard to tourism consultations and meetings with other parts of the country, I wondered if some other places might still be advertising our graveyards as a tourist attraction?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Not that I am aware of. I know we stopped our advertising some time ago. I do not know how I can really control that unless I put somebody on the site to control it. However, it has been indicated to me by CYI, and I am not quite sure if it was in a subsequent meeting or whether it was at the tourism conference, that they may have to take a look at the gravesites again; that maybe they should be utilizing them as tourist attractions. It was just a thought that the representative from CYI had and said it was something that he was going to explore with his colleagues.

**Mrs. Joe:** I would certainly agree that they are something that should be seen by other people but in a manner where they are not allowed to just go in and out at will. An organized tour, perhaps, would be something that could be thought about. The minister had just mentioned historical sites, that there was an overlap with renewable resources. There was an ad in the paper asking for labourers to work for the government and it was for the restoration of some buildings in Fork Selkirk. I wondered what consultation there was with regard to those buildings — restoring them and renovating them — and how long had that been going on. I am not familiar with Fort Selkirk; it is just that I know that there are a number of old buildings there and I understand that they are being restored. The ad is under wildlife services, renewable resources, or whatever; it is not under heritage.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have a historic site summer work plan and we are applying for some funding under the NEED Program. At the particular site that the member is asking about for Selkirk, they are going to be doing some more work there: shingling buildings and, I believe they are going to be doing some more restoration work on the Taylor and Drury foundation.

The sites are identified, and then the operations are carried out by renewable resources, wildlife and park services. The planning and project management will be done by tourism, heritage and cultural resources, by the heritage branch.

**Mrs. Joe:** In the paper last week — or on the radio, I cannot remember which it was — there was mention of Pierre Berton

coming up to Yukon. I guess what is happening, and we are all aware of it, is that there are a lot of books being written about the history of Yukon, and they usually go back to the Gold Rush. The people who come up to Yukon do not know the history past the Gold Rush. It is almost as if nothing had happened before that. Pierre Berton had, according to what I had heard or read, said that the history of the native people, of course, goes back hundreds of years before the Gold Rush and that the history should be written by an Indian person.

The *Yukon Indian News* each year puts out a tourist publication which includes the history of the Indian people in Yukon and which excludes the Gold Rush and many other things. It is a valuable piece of information and I think that the government contributes some money to that, as well as CYI and other groups. Now, I just wondered if the minister had any thoughts on the history of Yukon prior to the Gold Rush, other than Al Wright's book, or if there are any plans or thoughts about how that could be done? Pierre Berton had suggested that an Indian person do it and it is very possible that an Indian person can do it, but would the YTG contribute anything to it?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have already indicated that we have identified monies for publishing funds to assist communities in publishing their history and I could see that particular aspect of history being taken into account in a community's local history, the particular aspect of the native people who were common to that community. I have not had anyone approach me for funding, such as a native person to specifically write a book about Indian history. If they are going to, they had better do it fast because I am sure Mr. Berton will be writing a book as soon as he can about native history.

**Mrs. Joe:** I thought he had said it should be done by an Indian. I have one other question right now and that is in terms of Skookum Jim's house in Carcross. That building, of course, is falling apart, as are a number of other buildings. Years ago, when I was working with an Indian organization, we had considered trying to restore it but, of course, we did not have the expertise to do it. I wonder if that was anything the government had considered when they were talking about restoring other historical buildings?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I do not know if it has been brought to the attention of the department or not. It has not been brought to my attention but it will be taken under advisement now.

**Mr. Porter:** I would just like to ask the minister a question in relation to the previous area that has been discussed by the member preceding. In terms of the whole issue of contributions to the question of the history as it relates to native and aboriginal peoples in the Yukon, seeing as how the government has contributed in the past to other relevant historical material that talks about the history of the Yukon, would the government be prepared to look at assisting a native group, or organizations, or possibly even native people individually, in preparing some sort of documentation of pre-gold rush and pre-fur trade history of the Yukon?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That would be judged on the individual merit of the project just as any other project has been judged, and funding granted.

**Mr. Porter:** Is there any policy statement in respect of assistance to the preparation of historical documentation within the department?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, we do not have a set policy regarding that particular aspect.

**Mr. Porter:** If the situation more or less is an open door policy, should groups or individuals who wish to apply to undertake a certain project simply go through the process and develop a proposal?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is correct.

**Mr. Byblow:** I have just a couple of minor questions to clear out of the way.

The question of developing Whitehorse as a convention centre has been circulating around the industry and I am certain the minister is fully aware of it through the cooperative exercise with YVA. What is materializing on that this year? I looked desperately through the budget. I did not see any significant person-year increase or reallocation. Could the minister elaborate on that, perhaps also with

a view to the future in terms of its potential as a tourism attraction in a related way?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have identified, under tourism marketing, \$20,000 in order that they are able to finish the production of their convention marketing material. I believe, during the budget cuts, we had eliminated that, and we have given that to them now so they can complete that task. Depending on the numbers of inquiries — and I know just from a personal perspective, I do have a fair number of people calling my office making inquiries about conventions in the territory — there certainly is a potential for expansion in this area. Once we have the marketing information out and the packages out, depending on response we hear from this, we may be taking some further steps.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would assume that the further steps will be in subsequent budget years.

I have a question regarding highway sign policy. The minister has been seeking and receiving input from communities respecting the nature of a highway sign policy. Could the minister, at this point, indicate what is the developing policy now in respect to a new act governing those structures.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I am unable at this time to give the member that information. I have some communities to get in touch with yet. We have not arrived at a consensus or at a final decision. We are still in the process of discussing what the policy is going to be. I would like to indicate that we have had a tremendous amount of cooperation on the part of the communities. Once I have been in contact with the last of the communities, we will be in a position to realize our sign policy as it applies to those communities.

**Mr. Byblow:** What is the status of the infamous kiosk policy? As the minister is aware, that is something that materialized about eight years ago and it is in the circles of this government and actually bore fruit, I believe last year, as the first kiosk was erected by a particular Chamber of Commerce. Is that an intended item for construction this particular year within the developing sign policy? Are there actually going to be any of them constructed this year in communities?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** There will be, if the community so wishes. Like I say, we are in negotiation with the communities. If they so wish, we do have some funding and we would be able to build kiosks for them.

#### **On Administration**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** This 18 percent change is largely due to the reinstatement of the 10-day fortnight and we have identified \$25,000 for the interprovincial-territorial-federal minister of tourism conference which we will be hosting in September of 1983.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the \$25,000 part of the \$39,000 other funding identified on Page 212?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, I believe so.

**Mr. Byblow:** Has there been any departmental reorganization within the administration of tourism during this past year?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Is the member asking the question specifically with regard to person-years or positions?

**Mr. Byblow:** Positions.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Not that I am aware of, no.

#### **Administration in the amount of \$226,000 agreed to**

##### **On Library Services Branch**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Reorganization has brought together community libraries under a new activity called 'public libraries'. School libraries are the responsibility of the Department of Education. This reorganization has realized \$36,000 and one person-year which has been moved to the heritage branch effective for the 1983-84 year. The book budget, although down, was a reflection of a \$50,000 start-up for Porter Creek and Grey Mountain primary schools in 1982-83, and an advanced O&M of \$10,000. It is anticipated that the reduction in the number of books purchased in 1983-84 will correspond with the similar reduction in population.

**Mr. Byblow:** There is a reduction in the technical services of some 16 percent. What has brought that about?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The \$50,000 grant for school books for Porter Creek and Grey Mountain.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is the minister telling me that Porter Creek did

not get something?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No. If the member listened to what I had said earlier: the book budget, although down, was a reflection of a \$50,000 start-up for Porter Creek and Grey Mountain in 1982-83.

#### **Technical Services in the amount of \$209,000 agreed to**

##### **On Audio Visual Services**

##### **Audio Visual Services in the amount of \$93,000 agreed to**

##### **On Public Library Services**

**Mr. Byblow:** When the minister identifies, under Library Services Branch, the line item "Library Services" for \$294,000, does that at all relate expenditure-wise with the community learning centres or is this strictly the public libraries where, in some cases, they may exist in schools and be one and the same?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, it is just the public libraries.

##### **Public Library Services in the amount of \$294,000 agreed to**

##### **On Administration**

##### **Administration in the amount of \$53,000 agreed to**

##### **Library Services Branch in the amount of \$649,000 agreed to**

##### **On Yukon Archives**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Any change is largely due to the return to the 10-day fortnight.

##### **On Yukon Archives**

##### **Yukon Archives in the amount of \$224,000 agreed to**

##### **On Territorial Archivist**

##### **Territorial Archivist in the amount of \$52,000 agreed to**

##### **Yukon Archives in the amount of \$276,000 agreed to**

##### **On Heritage Branch**

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I have a statement I would like to make regarding the heritage branch, as it is of interest, I am sure, to the members opposite from the questions I have been asked in Question Period.

The heritage branch was formed in November, 1981 and a new director was recruited less than a year ago. Major activities within the branch include: administration and coordination of heritage issues; historic sites development; a museum's function, which includes museum grants and technical assistance to museums; the Art Gallery of the Whitehorse Public Library; and archaeology, including the administration of the scientists and explorers and archaeological sites permit systems. The summary of the branch's major objectives would be to develop and foster cooperation and coordinate heritage policies and programs to transmit an understanding of Yukon's vast and important heritage resources.

In reviewing the past year's accomplishments of the heritage branch, I am pleased to report that a number of issues raised in this House have been attended to. After a lapse of some months because of a change in position by Whitehorse Copper, negotiations are near to conclusion regarding the lease by the Yukon Territorial Government of a significant portion of the historic Kopper King, Kopper Queen and Carlyle mining properties for interpretive purposes. This project also involves active participation by the Yukon Historical Museums Association and other interested parties.

A recent meeting among officials of my branch, the Council for Yukon Indians and the City of Whitehorse has reached a satisfactory agreement concerning the protection of the Riverdale archaeological site. The Friendship Totem Pole will be repaired this summer and plans are underway to have an appropriate bronze plaque cast and installed. The cairn is to be supplied by the City of Whitehorse. Although full or partial repatriation of Yukon's archaeological artifacts must await the development of a proper facility, negotiations with the Archaeological Survey of Canada have concluded that significant and displayable artifacts will be replicated in plastic and given to Yukon upon request.

Other activities of the branch over the past year include active participation in the design and implementation of a variety of structures and stabilization projects at Fort Selkirk and the 30-Mile River area. These projects were funded under the Canada/Yukon Tourism Agreement and carried out with the assistance of the Department of Renewable Resources.

In cooperation with the Tourism Planning Branch, the design and supervision of the construction of the S.S. Tutshi, Carcross Visitor Information Centre. This is another Canada/Yukon Tourism Agreement-funded project constructed by renewable resources. The

distribution of some \$60,000 in operating and maintenance costs and capital grants to six museums in Yukon: these grants were of great benefit in assisting our local museums to be open during the summer tourist season.

<sup>32</sup> The display of 12 month long art exhibitions, includes a special Canada art bank expedition in the basement of the MacBride Museum. The Art Gallery also organized or assisted in the delivery of over ten extension activities such as art classes, film showings and lectures.

The beginning of the formulation of a new heritage policy for Yukon: this process will continue into this fiscal year and will include an opportunity for public input and comment. It is our desire to translate this policy, once completed, into a comprehensive heritage act at the earliest possible date.

With the assistance of funding from the employment development program, this winter has been especially busy. Projects the heritage branch have initiated include: the design of the interpretive display programs for the Alaska Highway, Watson Lake visitor interpretation centre and a similar facility being constructed for the S.S. *Tutshi* at Carcross and both interpretive displays will be constructed this spring for summer openings; the writing and production of three interpretive visitor oriented brochures, which include the topics Fort Selkirk, S.S. *Tutshi*, Carcross and the Alaska Highway, and all three brochures will be ready for this coming tourist season.

A major point of interest, sign program, was launched. In cooperation with renewable resources, 39 new signs have been produced, including 17 for sites along the Yukon River. Sign topics cover a wide range of human and natural history subjects. These signs will be erected during the late spring and summer. The sign program also included the repair of five existing signs and the production of 11 travel information signs. The sign program is the shared responsibility of the heritage branch and tourism, planning and development.

Again, utilizing the construction capability of renewable resources, some 100 exterior doors and windows for the S.S. *Tutshi* have been designed and built. These will be fitted and installed this summer under the branch's capital program.

The design of the newly renovated area to display the permanent art collection: this project was completed and officially opened less than a month ago and I am sure everyone will agree that it is a beautiful addition to the foyer of the YTG building.

Major highlights and programs for the new 1983-84 fiscal year will develop and strengthen the excellent beginnings that have been made. As indicated earlier, the two visitor information centre interpretive displays as well as the three brochure projects will be completed for this summer's tourist season. Historic resource inventory work will continue into northern Yukon in addition to work planned along the Yukon River. Much of the .5 casual person-years identified in the historic sites activity will be devoted to this purpose. Resource inventory and analysis is an essential prerequisite to future planning and development.

Work will continue on the preparation of heritage policy and legislation. \$30,000 will again be made available in the form of operating and maintenance grants to local museums to assist in covering operating costs and hiring summer staff. This is in addition to a similar \$30,000 which has been allocated for local museums capital projects. In addition to a normal schedule of art exhibitions, a major exhibition of paintings and drawings by nationally-known Maurice Haycock will be shown in September.

Discussion is still going on as to the administration of the art curator; whether it will be assumed by the Friends of the Gallery or remain within the government structure. Department officials have made the offer to the Friends of the Gallery and we are awaiting the response. This budget maintains the curator position at .75 person-years.

In addition to the continuation of established programs, I am pleased to draw your attention to two new initiatives; the introduction of a \$5,000 heritage publishing assistance program which will provide cost-shared funding for the publication, by local heritage societies, of at least one local history project. Details of this program will be publicly announced within a few weeks and should help fill the need expressed by many Yukoners who are

committed to the preservation of Yukon's local community histories.

Due to an upcoming reorganization within the department, one permanent person-year has been allocated to the branch to provide for the recruitment of a museums advisor later this fall. The need for a museums advisor has been identified on a number of occasions, including the Yukon Historical Museum Association-sponsored Kyte Report. This position will be of great benefit to all local museums by assisting them in developing improved displays, artifact care and staff training.

I am pleased to introduce and support this modest, yet realistic, heritage branch program. The resources of Yukon are rich and diverse and deserve our strong and unanimous support. Thank you.

<sup>33</sup> **Mrs. Joe:** That was a thorough report from the minister and I thank her for it. I have a question in regard to the archaeological site permits. There is an estimate of 40 this year, and I was just wondering, because I do not really know the extent of them, what are the criteria for allowing someone to have an archaeological permit? I am not really sure who can get them and what kind of evidence they have to present.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The person wishing the permit applies to the department and it is investigated by Mr. Dale Perry; the decision is made whether the permit should be granted or not, and it is the Commissioner who signs the final permit. I give my approval and the Commissioner issues the permit.

**Mrs. Joe:** Is there a minimum or maximum length of time that the permits can be used; for instance, a summer or a year?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe it is indicated on the permit.

**Mrs. Joe:** I just have one other question, and I am hoping that some of my colleagues will have many more. I was a bit curious as to the Thirty Mile River area that is being developed, and I am not really sure what that program or that plan is. There seems to be an awful lot of information coming out in regard to that area and I do not know what it is. I wonder if the minister might give me a little bit more information than what she has already given in her report?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I really do not have any more to add. I do not have any notes on the Thirty Mile; I could give them to the member in her office or bring them back tomorrow.

**Mrs. Joe:** I would appreciate that because I do not know about and I would like more information. I would just like to mention, before I sit down, that I am pleased the minister is going to allow public input into the heritage and cultural policy paper.

**Mr. McDonald:** During the minister's remarks on this branch, she mentioned that the government is supporting, financially, six museums and I see, on page 219, that the number is seven. I am very sensitive about the fate of the Keno museum and I am just hoping that the Keno museum does not represent that difference of one. I just want some reassurance of that, please.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It is a typographical error.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I asked a question in November about the federal civil servant whose title is Yukon Archaeologist. I wonder if that person is making travel plans to move here or is there going to be a change in personnel?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, he is an employee of the federal government and he is simply responsible for this particular area under his job description. I understand he does come up here from time to time and he is in communication with our department.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is there a position put forward by this government that the Yukon archaeologist ought to live here?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I suppose that would be ideal; however, I do not know if the federal government would be prepared to do that, because I understand he is responsible for some other northern areas, so they may want him to live in that particular area. As far as I am concerned, it is better than having no identification of an archaeologist for the particular areas.

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now recess until 4:15 p.m.

*Recess*

<sup>34</sup> **Mr. Chairman:** I will now call Committee of the Whole to order.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** For the hon. member for Whitehorse North



Centre: the Thirty Mile River is, as I thought it was, the stabilization of the *S.S. Evelyn* boat.

**Mrs. Joe:** That does not make me any wiser. I just have one other question. I wanted more information on the archaeological impact review; there is an estimate of \$30,000. When the reviews are done, are they made available to the public?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes they are made public, and we are anticipating more this year.

**Mrs. Joe:** I am a bit interested in that and, since they are, I would request a couple of copies, so that I may learn a little bit more.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe there is a list this long, but if the member is interested she could check with the department for any specifics.

*On Historic Sites*

*Historic Sites in the amount of \$72,000 agreed to*

*On Art Gallery*

*Art Gallery in the amount of \$28,000 agreed to*

*On Administration*

*Administration in the amount of \$62,000 agreed to*

*On Museums*

*Museums in the amount of \$56,000 agreed to*

*Heritage Branch in the amount of \$218,000 agreed to*

*On Tourism Planning and Development*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** In the 1982-83 budget a service contract was administered by Tourism Planning Development for the Yukon Visitors Association administration component. These funds have been transferred to a new activity in tourism marketing to be administered as a grant-in-lieu of a service contract. It was felt that the Yukon Visitors Association does not provide a service for government, but rather works in a cooperative effort with private and public sectors.

**Mr. Byblow:** What was that transferred amount?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** It is \$50,000.

**Mr. Byblow:** I may have asked this in the past, but perhaps the minister can refresh my memory: who constitutes the three people in this particular branch. I do not want names, just positions in terms of their capacities.

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** The people are the planning and development director, program manager and tourism development planner.

**Mr. Byblow:** This is not the branch where a person-year was seconded to YVA?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, it is. There is a tourism development officer seconded to YVA.

Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, the three positions are program manager, tourism development planner and tourism development officer, who is seconded to YVA.

**Mr. Byblow:** The minister indicated that there was a transfer of \$50,000 from planning to marketing and that, obviously, would explain the 25 percent decrease. However, if you do the calculation of adding in the \$50,000 to the \$174,000, you get \$224,000. There is, in effect, a cut here of what amounts to \$9,000. Is that an accurate reading?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, it is. I believe the other has something to do with a person who was away on educational leave.

*Tourism Planning and Development in the amount of \$174,000 agreed to*

*On Tourism Marketing*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** A new structural change to the Marketing Branch has been initiated for the 1983-84 fiscal year. A new activity, entitled cooperative marketing, has been established to clearly identify those funds associated with the marketing council, including a grant to the YVA of \$50,000 for marketing administration. Prior to this break-out, all marketing funds were identified under one activity and, therefore, did not clearly identify the contribution to the council.

New funding in tourism promotion, in the amount of \$100,000, for production of eight to ten 90-second film clips to be used as fillers on television — these are the vignettes I had mentioned earlier — marketing of these products will be for the fall season and targeted for British Columbia and Ontario; \$20,000 for convention marketing; \$30,000 for a local awareness program to improve the

image and attitude of the tourism industry in Yukon; and an enhancement of \$5,000 for media visits which play a vital role in advertising Yukon in newspaper and magazine articles.

**Mr. Byblow:** I would like to spend a little bit of time understanding the figures here in relation to the expenditure of those funds through the marketing council. There is identified a marketing figure of \$456,000 and a separate line item of \$752,000 for cooperative marketing. Given that the marketing, aside from personnel, constitutes \$900,000, is it fair to say that, between the Yukon government and YVA, that \$900,000 is identified in a marketing strategy, or is that oversimplifying the way the money is spent?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No. That is fair.

**Mr. Byblow:** The amount of money referred to, \$900,000, essentially is this government's contribution to the marketing strategy of the cooperative marketing program and it would be supplemented, I would assume, by money from the industry, supplemented and not shown here though? Would the combined monies from this government and the YVA — and the minister can identify if there are other sources — then constitute the marketing strategy that the joint council or the marketing council spends?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is correct.

**Mr. Byblow:** I am so well-informed. On the \$117,000 that is identified for information centres — there is a substantial increase here — could the minister elaborate what the increase is intended to do within the information centres?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** We have three new centres this year. We have a centre in Dawson City, Watson Lake and a new location, Carcross. The expanded service now has six locations in Yukon. New funding was needed to maintain the high level of service that the information centres provide to the touring public.

**Mr. Byblow:** Could the minister identified the other six locations, if they are in addition to the new three, or the other three if they are in addition to the first three?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** There are six altogether: Dawson, Watson Lake, Carcross, Haines Junction, Whitehorse and Beaver Creek.

**Mr. Byblow:** As I recollect, there was an information centre put up in Faro last year. Did that funding come from this source, and will it do so again?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I believe that that information centre in Faro was done by a lady who was in fact responsible for her own travel agency and was a member of the YVA and offered to do so; she did not receive any funding from the government.

**Mr. Byblow:** I could stand to be corrected, but I believe there was funding procured, perhaps not through tourism but through one of the student programs. Could the minister explain the transfer payment identified at \$50,000?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is for administrative costs; marketing administration for the Yukon Visitors Association.

**Mr. Byblow:** Is any money that is given to the KVA identified here or, if it is not identified here, where is it identified? I understand that this government does provide a grant to that sister organization. Where does it show up and how much is it?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** No, we do not provide a grant to the KVA.

**Mr. Byblow:** With respect to the contract work that they recently tendered, did this come from the program money under the sub-agreement, and not through any grant as a standard item from government?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** That is correct. They received \$300,000 from the Canada/Yukon Tourism Agreement and I believe they added \$450,000.

*On Marketing*

*Marketing in the amount of \$456,000 agreed to*

*On Information Centres*

*Information Centres in the amount of \$117,000 agreed to*

*On Cooperative Marketing*

*Cooperative Marketing in the amount of \$752,000 agreed to*

*Tourism Marketing in the amount of \$1,325,000 agreed to*

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Just to clarify the record, the member for Faro had asked me about the \$50,000 in transfer payments and I had given him an answer that it was for administrative costs for YVA: that is not correct, it is for... I am sorry, it is for the YVA,

after all.

**Mr. Byblow:** Just to clarify what may be a confusing *Hansard* record, the marketing grant identified on page 226 is identical to the transfer payment or not? If it is identical to the transfer payment, is it for administrative costs granted to the YVA?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** Yes, it is for administrative costs granted to the YVA.

*Department of Tourism, Heritage and Cultural Resources in the amount of \$2,868,000 agreed to*

**On Department of Renewable Resources**

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I thought we were just going to clear this one and carry on.

It is with great pleasure that I present to this House this budget for renewable resources. While the departmental estimates indicate a considerable decrease in expenditures from 1982-83, this does not reflect a decrease in the level or the service that we are providing. The reason it has decreased is because the economic development agreement — renewable resource agreement — has run out. We are in the process now of trying to keep our department together and take into consideration the fact that the economic development agreement has run out.

When we go through some of these areas, section-by-section, I believe some of these things will come out. I do not think there is a necessity for any other comments.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the general debate area of the discussion of this particular department, I probably will be covering ground that should probably fit with the specific sections of the budget. I think in terms of the general debate, if we cover most of the areas of concern, it will speed up the process of further discussion on a clause by clause basis of the various line items.

I would like to begin the general debate with a question to the minister and ask the minister about the staffing conditions within his department. Can he confirm whether or not his department is fully staffed or understaffed, and, if there are vacancies within the department, can he give an indication as to when those vacancies will be filled?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Well I do not think there is any department of this government that is completely staffed at any time. We have about a 10 percent vacancy factor in the government. This department is no different than any other. Whenever we do have vacancies we try to fill them as soon as possible. In some cases we are fairly successful; in others we are not. I believe the record for this department is as good as any in the government.

**Mr. Porter:** My question to the minister was: are there any vacancies within the department at present time? If so, when will those vacancies be filled?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I said yes, there are vacancies in the department as there is in every department of the government. They will be filled as soon as we can possibly fill them.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister give us a statement as to exactly the location of those vacancies within the department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, I do not have that information with me.

**Mr. Porter:** My understanding is that the department is also responsible for the staffing of campground attendants. In terms of the policy in respect to this department's handling of that area I would like to ask the minister if, when they do look at the staffing of campgrounds attendants, they have a policy in place which respects the community and the inhabitants of the community. In other words, are the people who are placed in campground jobs, in every case, people who reside in the nearest community to those campgrounds?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we try as much as possible to utilize local people in our campgrounds. In a great many instances, some of the people we use have been with the department summer after summer. Whenever a new position does come along, we try to fill it with local residents.

**Mr. Porter:** On the larger question of policy in respect to staff, earlier last year there was some indications that there was, in the department, a general morale problem. I would just like to ask the minister: is morale a problem within the department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not know if we are here to talk about

morale or whether we are here to talk about a budget. There have been some morale problems in the department. We are consistently working to try to overcome the problems that we have. I think a lot of the morale problem has been developed over the period of the last four or five years because of the economic development agreement, for one, and the departmental personnel kind of running their own show, which has to come to an end. We, as the government, have to be responsible for the money that is expended, and the minister and the deputy minister and the management personnel have to know what is going on, and have to have some control over the actions of their employees. While the problems that have developed in the department are being overcome on a fairly good basis, there is still room for improvement, but the department morale problem has been improving significantly in the last few months.

**Mr. Porter:** Just a further question along that particular line, if I may pursue it a little further: where there is a dispute of a substantial nature between management and staff, could the minister give us an indication as to what kind of process is set in place to resolve any dispute?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Any time there is a dispute there are appeal processes that are available to the employee, through the Public Service Commission. They have that avenue to dispute it. Other than that, if the person is not satisfied with the final resolution that is made, he has the option to go to court.

**Mr. Porter:** Say you had an issue that is not deemed to be of a nature sufficient to call in outside agencies, such as the Public Service Commission or even the courts, where it is, for example, an individual case where it may be nothing more than personal harassment of an employee by senior staff management level. In an instance where there is a minor problem of that nature that, on the outset, would look like a minor problem but, from the employee's perspective, it could be major, how would you deal with that kind of a situation?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We would deal with that the same as we would deal with any other complaint in the government. It is up to the management of the department, the deputy minister and the minister of the department, ultimately, to make the final decision. When that decision is made, then the employee has methods available to him, under the *Public Service Commission Act* or the court.

If the member across the floor is trying to get down to one specific instance, I would not be prepared to talk about it.

**Mr. Porter:** No, he should divest himself of any paranoid feelings he may have of my getting down to a specific issue, because that is not my intention.

In respect to the management decision process that you say takes place and is eventually implemented within the department, is there a policy within the department of consultation between the senior management people and the employee when a management decision is taken? Do they consult with the employees?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** All I can do is say again what the method is that is used; if there is any action taken against any member of the department, it is taken by the supervisory staff of the department. It is not taken by the members of that department. That is one of the morale problems that has developed in this department; the staff was constantly running its own show, and you cannot have that. You cannot have that in any function of government, or in private industry. Management has to be responsible, just exactly as I am ultimately responsible for what goes on in that department. When management has to make a decision, they make the decision. There are appeal processes against that decision and that is the long and the short of it.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the overall consultation process that one would envision there being within every department of government, as it exists within every organization that is set up, is there any attempt, where new policy initiative is established, to brief the employees as to the policy guidelines and the policy philosophy? Is there a regular briefing session held between senior management and the employees within the department? I can foresee this happening to better implement eventual decisions that are made by the department as a whole.



**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, there are regular sessions that go on between management and staff, as there are in any good operation that is run by the government or by private industry. There are consultations that go on, and when a new policy is brought in, that policy is relayed to the people in the department.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the policy area, when there is a process of developing the policies, are the field employees — the people who have to work out in the field — contacted for their point of view, and how does their point of view get involved in the eventual formulation of policy?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am reaching the point where I am not going to answer any more of these questions because there is a court case going on right now and I am not going to prejudice it by statements that I make in this House. What I will say is that, usually, almost 100 percent of the time, everyone in the department knows what is going on and usually, before policy is ever proposed to the minister, discussion has taken place in the department. Regardless of whether there is or whether there is not, the policy is set by the government; it is not set by the people who work for the department; it is set by the management.

**Mr. Porter:** If there is a real expressed concern that the minister's answer in respect to policy as it relates to the internal workings of the department may be construed by any outside body as to having some effect on a possible legal case, then I will refrain from asking questions directly in that area. I would like to turn the next question on to the area respecting the involvement of the public in the formation of policy. Can the minister give us some indication as to how the general public, who supposedly the resources of this particular department are held in trust for, are involved? What process is set up for their involvement in policy formulation in this department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Elections every four years, for one; public votes for the party that they feel is going to do the best job for them. In this case, it was the party that I happen to represent. There is public involvement in a lot of the policies that are developed in the government; a lot of the policies that are developed in the government are developed by resolutions of our party. Those policies come from various areas, whether it is public or private.

**Mr. Porter:** I am sure that the government does a lot more than simply use the final statistics in the polls as a barometer of how the public feels about wildlife policies they have initiated. Is there not a process by which the government establishes contact with certain specific groups which have a direct role to play in wildlife management and discuss with them possible policy initiatives?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member across the floor is well aware that we have policies in place and methods of getting those policy proposals from the people. We have a wildlife advisory committee that is representative of every organization in the territory that has anything to do with wildlife. All of our proposals are put before them before they are brought forward by this government.

**Mr. Porter:** Does the government take an enforcement philosophy or conservation mentality to the management of Yukon's wildlife? Which area is given priority?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I suggest the member across the floor read *The Wildlife Act* and the regulations attached.

**Mr. Porter:** I believe that the tradition of a democratic parliament puts some responsibility on ministers of government to answer questions put to them by the opposition, so I give the member time to reflect on that and put the question again to the minister. In respect to the overall philosophy of the management of this particular department, is it one of enforcement or one of conservation? What is the priority of the government?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This is not "Twenty Questions" here. This is supposed to be general debate, where I put the government's position forward — which we do by putting the budget forward — and the opposition has time to debate it. If they want to stand up and make all of their points, that is fine. However, this is not "Twenty Questions" and some of these questions, quite frankly, I am not prepared to answer. On how we develop policy, he is as well aware as I am. A question of that nature is ludicrous; it should not even be here. He knows how the policy is developed. He knows that there is a wildlife advisory committee, for example.

**Mr. Porter:** If the minister does not want to answer the questions that I raise, then I simply suggest that on every question that I do bring up, he can state his position as to not wanting to answer. To indicate its position, can the government give the House a comparison of dollar allocation between monies spent on enforcement-oriented measures as opposed to programs that promote conservation of our wildlife resources?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The enforcement of this department is done only because it is necessary. The conservation of wildlife is the policy of this government: the wise use and management of our resources. We want to use them to the best use of the people of the territory. Unfortunately, whenever you have rules and regulations, you have to enforce them so enforcement also becomes a function of any department of government. We do have enforcement, but by far the largest part of our budget deals with conservation. That is what it is all about. That is why we do the studies so that we know how to handle the wildlife.

For example, we brought in sub zones within our game management zones in order to separate certain areas so that we can protect the wildlife there; so that we could conserve the wildlife. That also means that we have to enforce the rules and regulations that we bring out. Quite frankly, I think the member across the floor is trying to stir up some kind of a confrontational debate and I really do not see the necessity for it.

**Mr. Porter:** Totally untrue; I am simply trying to elicit some response from the government as to the policy programs and dollars spent within his department. Aside from the trapper education program, what other educational programs are there within the department's public relations mandate and what percentage of person-years in the department are there allocated to be employed directly in the area of education?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There are a great many things that we do in the educational field. One of them happens to be one that was just released today: the recipes for bear meat. There is one person assigned in the department specifically to education. A great deal of work is done on the educational side of this department for the benefit of all Yukoners.

**Mr. Porter:** Aside from saying a great deal of work is done in this area, just to further clarify that particular statement, are there, for example, regular meetings in classroom situations where the department personnel call in general community members to discuss wildlife issues? Are there attempts made by the department to contact the schools throughout the Yukon and go into a classroom situation and give an overview of the wildlife department and its management? Are those things going on on a regular basis?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes. I would also like to comment that we do a great deal to try to educate the public. For example, we have just completed an audio visual of field dressing of game. In fact, it has been received so well that we have been inundated with requests from the provinces and, I believe, from Alaska to supply copies to them. We are hopeful we will even succeed in recovering all of our costs of production.

Perhaps these detailed questions should wait until we get to the sections, rather than dealing with them during general debate.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the program area, one of the initiatives that was undertaken by this government the last fiscal year was the implementation of a wolf control program that had as its central theme the poisoning of wolves. Everyone knows the consequences of the decision and the kind of reaction that it sparked in the community at large; not only in our community but throughout the country, and also outside of the country. In respect to the wolf poisoning program, my understanding and the public's understanding is that it generally has stopped. I guess there has not been very much publication of the process in terms of the fact that the wolf control program by the use of poison is no longer in effect by this government. Has the government any plans for public education as to that specific question?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would like to clarify one inaccuracy that the member across the floor has said; that was that poisoning was the wolf control program. That was not the wolf control program, nor was it even a major part of the wolf control program; it was a minor part. The proposal that was brought out by myself and the

department was for a study to be done on wolves. The poison program was only done around the City of Whitehorse to answer an emergency situation and to help people save their animals: their dogs and horses. It was a very small and minor part of the wolf program. Incidentally, we put four poison baits out. In the Province of British Columbia, for example, they have used well over 2,000 poison baits this year, and in the Province of Alberta they use hundreds every year as well. The whole thing was blown out of proportion by members opposite, specifically, and by the media in particular. Our wolf control program is going ahead, as was announced, and any time the member opposite wants to have a copy of the program, it is available upstairs from the executive offices and from the Department of Renewable Resources. I believe that he already has a copy of it. It is going ahead; there have been announcements in the paper in the last week or two about their moose collaring program, that is also part of the wolf management program. All of that is going on on an ongoing basis and will continue to go on.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister give this House an indication as to what the cost of that program was to this government?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I would suggest that the member wait until we get to the departments. All of his questions are dealing with specifics in departments; in the programs. I will try to answer all of these questions as we get to them. General debate is not the place to ask all these questions.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** On wolves; under which lines are their expenditures. I expect there to be expenditure on the wolf control program under several of the lines, especially on page 234 and 236.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The wolf management program is under wildlife and parks. That is where we will deal with it. The cost of the wolf program, I believe, is in the neighbourhood of \$120,000 or so to date. When we deal with it I would have to refer to my notes. That is the reason that I suggested that something as specific as that should be raised at the time rather than in general debate.

**Mr. Porter:** Earlier this year there were three animals found poisoned on Kluane Lake and we had an announcement from the government that they were pursuing a legal investigation as to what caused the animals to die of related poisoning. Subsequent to that there was also an additional animal found and that animal was suspected to have been poisoned. Can the minister give us an indication as to whether the second animal was poisoned? Can he also give us an update as to the progress of the investigation that his department is carrying out with respect to the poisoning of those animals found on Kluane Lake?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As the member opposite stated, and as I have stated in the House, yes, the first three animals were poisoned. We know that; we had a study done on them. We sent the carcasses out for analysis. There is an investigation still going on. The last animal is suspected to have been poisoned, but it is felt that it is not justifiable that we send it out for analysis at this time, unless it subsequently becomes necessary that we do have an analysis done on it for poison. The benefit to us to find out whether it was poisoned or not is questionable.

**Mr. Porter:** Has the department committed itself to looking at a long-term strategy in dealing with the area that can be classified as the predator-prey relationship? Have there been extensive studies done by his department as to the complexity of that management question within Yukon? If those studies have been done, have there been some specific recommendations made as a result of those studies that would cause a management system to be put in place over the long-term to eventually control and deal with the question of predator-prey?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I announced that the predator-prey study dealing with wolves was a three-year project. In fact, it is even greater than that, it is a seven-year project. However, in three years we hope to have some adequate information; this year or next year we hope to have some preliminary information, and enough to get us started on it. But a predator-prey study is not done in one year.

**Mr. Porter:** One of the alarming statistics we have heard in respect of this department is that, in a study area canvassed by this department, they have found that the calf mortality rate is as high as 85 percent. They have announced that they are undergoing a

scientific-oriented study to determine the cause of that high mortality rate with in the calf moose population in that particular game zone.

Studies have been done elsewhere, and specifically I might point to Alaska, in which the conclusions of the study have identified predators other than the wolf as being responsible. If this should be the situation in respect to Yukon, is there any management data that the minister has on hand as to how to deal with those other prey? For example, specifically, I would be thinking of the bear population as being a responsible predator in respect to the high mortality rate.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we do have a lot of information available on bears. There have also been studies done in Alaska that show it is the wolf that has done the damage, so, it depends on the area and that is the reason we are trying to do these predator-prey studies and why we are doing the one on the moose right now, because we are in a serious position in Yukon right now. If the calf mortality is as high as it is, we are looking at only a year or two down the road when we will have to reduce hunting in a great, large area of the territory and we are very concerned about it. In fact, we are so concerned about it that, in the Finlayson area, for example, we have already destroyed quite a number of wolves on the recommendation of biologists in my department. In the other areas, we are presently collaring all the moose and we will be collaring the calves. There will also be collars on them that will identify when the calf is no longer alive and we will try immediately to find out what has caused the death of the calf; whether it be a bear or whether it be a wolf, or what the situation is.

We are now confident that it is not a factor of starvation in the adult animals. There is some other answer as to why the calf population is not increasing and we suspect that it is wolves. Now, there might be some bear predation, but we feel, at least at this time, that it is mostly wolves and we expect to find out and know that by next spring.

**Mr. Porter:** The minister mentions the Finlayson caribou herd as being an area which they are concerned about. The records will show that his department has acted in the fashion to curtail hunting of that herd and, specifically, have called upon the general hunting public to refrain from taking bulls in specific areas of the herd's habitat. Can the minister tell us whether or not, in his opinion, at this present time, the problem with the Finlayson caribou herd is to such an extent that possibly we may see closure of hunting of any animals regardless of sex of that particular herd in the very near future?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No. I do not believe we will have to totally restrict it — if we can ask the public and, if the public will respond, to not shooting the female animals. I know it is hard in some cases to differentiate between the male and the female. As I said, we have reduced the wolf population in that area and we know that it was the wolf in that area because of the kill sites. We identified a great number of kill sites when this program was going on in the area. We know that the wolf was doing a great deal of damage there and we think we have reduced the wolf population significantly this year. By conservation of the caribou that are there now, plus perhaps some additional wolf management in future years, we will be able to maintain the level in the herd.

**Mr. Porter:** It should be noted here that I do not share the minister's problem of identifying the difference between male or female. With respect to the management of caribou, I believe the minister was a recipient of a letter from the chief of the Liard band, who brought to the minister's attention, the possibility that the Little Rancheria caribou herd was suffering from over-hunting. This particular caribou herd has, as its habitat, not only land within the Yukon, but also land in northern British Columbia. Has the minister, or anyone in his department, contacted the BC wildlife officials to mutually discuss this particular problem?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We are aware of the complaint that the herd is reducing. In fact, my departmental personnel have looked at that situation. We have a problem that we cannot, with the personnel that we have and the money that we have allocated, go into management programs for every area of the territory. We are trying to concentrate on the critical areas around the populated areas,

Whitehorse and the Finlayson area, where a great many of the Indian bands, for example, utilize the caribou. Yes, we are aware of it. I could not tell you whether my biologists have been in contact with the British Columbia biologists, but I will almost guarantee that they have.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister tell us whether or not there are ongoing studies being conducted on the Porcupine caribou herd and, if so, can he give us an indication as to the level of expenditure committed to those studies; would it be the same as years past or have funds allocated for the purpose of studying the Porcupine caribou herd declined at all?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, the studies are still going on on the Porcupine caribou herd. To the best of my knowledge, we have not reduced the amount of money that is expended in that area but I could not give the member opposite a firm answer on that.

**Mr. Porter:** In those studies that have been conducted, and the ones presently underway, are those studies designed in such a fashion as to indicate the critical areas of the habitat area of the Porcupine caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, that is one of the main reasons why the studies are ongoing. For example, on the calving grounds, the study on the North Slope; a lot of work has happened up there. Also, the Dempster Highway; a great deal of work was done for the Dempster Highway management plan. They are ongoing. When the caribou are migrating we usually have four or five biologists out dealing with the caribou and we are trying to identify all the critical areas that would affect the Porcupine caribou herd. Incidentally, I should also say that contrary to a lot of reports that the Porcupine caribou herd is endangered, it has actually increased by approximately 25,000 in number in the last three or four years.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the question of protection of the habitat area of the Porcupine caribou herd, the most critical area has to be those grounds used by the herd for the purposes of calving. In respect to the studies that are done by the minister, is there some point in time when we can expect a recommendation as to some sort of protective recommendation being given by his department for the calving grounds? What I am thinking about here is, for instance, giving the calving grounds of the Porcupine caribou herd a possible designation such as to those that would fall under national or international park sites.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** In our Northern Yukon Resource Management Model, we have already proposed a national park in the western half of the northern Yukon, and the main reason we proposed that was to protect the calving grounds of the caribou.

**Mr. Porter:** Is the minister confident that the proposed north Yukon park that his government has advocated encompasses all those critical calving grounds that the Porcupine caribou herd utilizes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we feel that our proposal for the western half of the north Yukon for the protection of the caribou is adequate to look after the calving grounds. Caribou have calved in some areas outside the area we have proposed; however, that happens only infrequently.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the question of the proposed north Yukon park as advocated by this government, can the minister give us an update as to the progress of the talks that have been carried out between his government and the federal government, respectively, on the park; at what stage are those talks now being held?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** They are part of the COPE land claims negotiation and, as we are part of that, it is an ongoing process that we are involved in. When that is resolved, I hope we can resolve the whole problem of the north slope.

**Mr. Porter:** Realizing that the government does not favour an international agreement with respect to the management of the Porcupine caribou herd and its habitat, does this government view a joint agreement with the Northwest Territories government as a necessary step for better management of that species?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We are in agreement with negotiating with the NWT and having them involved in an agreement; however, as to a joint agreement, no. We feel that the caribou mostly travel between Alaska and Yukon Territory; some of them go through the Northwest Territories and, for that area, to deal with the ones that

go into the Northwest Territories, we are quite willing to sit down and reach some agreement with them. We would hope that we could have an agreement that looks after everybody.

**Mr. Porter:** Aside from the fact of having ideas of their own as to the setting aside or designating certain land use to the north slope of the Yukon, what reasons can this government give to support its position of not favouring an international agreement with respect to the Porcupine caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We have a very strong reason, as I stated in the House. The member is asking questions that he has asked in Question Period in the House. The reason we do not want an international agreement is because the management of game in the NWT and the Yukon is a function of the territorial governments. It is a function of the Government of Alaska. There is no need for an international agreement, which then brings in two more players: the federal governments.

**Mr. Porter:** I believe that at that time, in response to further questioning on the matter, the minister stated that should there be a problem, it would be just a situation they could handle with common sense; and sit down and talk to each other on that. I think that the people of the Yukon, and if the caribou could speak they, too, would probably tell you that that is simply not good enough. I think they would like to have some assurance that the caribou will be protected in instances where one particular jurisdiction or the other would propose and implement industrial development that could have a serious effect on the particular caribou herd. In respect to this question, in the event of massive proposed development of an industrial nature in the north Yukon, or in the State of Alaska, would the government then undertake to re-examine its position at that particular point, and look toward an international agreement to protect the caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, I think I have made our position quite clear. We have the management of game in the territory, and that is the way we would like it to stay. We do not have any problem with Alaska. In fact, the Alaskans are not even concerned with the caribou that go into Alaska. They do not hunt them over there. They do not have any problem with it. That is one of the reasons why they do not want their federal government involved because they do not think there is any necessity for it. Ninety percent of the management of the caribou rests within the Yukon Territory. We accept that and we are quite willing to sit down and hammer out some kind of agreement that will protect both sides so that if they do want to utilize the caribou that go into Alaska they can do so. Also, we will agree to sit down and talk to the Northwest Territories government about utilization of the caribou that migrate into the Northwest Territories. We are just as concerned about the protection of the caribou as any other person in the territory. Maybe the member across the floor thinks he speaks for the caribou now, but I think that my department has a great deal more expertise about speaking for caribou than he does. We are very concerned about protecting the caribou and its habitats. As time change and industrialization happens, if it ever does happen, it will all be reassessed at that time; when he and I are probably long gone.

**Mr. Porter:** What is the minister's response to the idea that has been put forward in previous instances; where, because of the critical importance that the Porcupine caribou herd has to the indigenous and aboriginal peoples, should any action be undertaken by the government or industry that could have the effect of depleting the resource to such an extent that the reliance that the people have on the caribou is broken, that the government or industry would have a responsibility to initiate another food source. In this instance, you could look at the whole question of domestication of wild animals or the introduction of, for example, reindeer herding. Should a catastrophe ever occur that nobody would ever hope to take place, would the minister agree that the government would have some responsibility to implement such a plan?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I want to make it clear that I am not sitting here negotiating the land claims and I am not here negotiating the land claims to deal with the caribou for Old Crow specifically. We, as a government, are very concerned with maintaining the Porcupine caribou herd. I think that any further governments,

whether it be a Progressive Conservative Government or whether it be an NDP Government, or whatever, would be just as concerned with maintaining that caribou herd. I do not believe that we are going to see, in either one of our lifetimes, the decimation of the Porcupine caribou herd. If it does happen in the future, I think we should leave it to the legislators of that day to make some decision on it.

As for domesticating animals, such as reindeer, I would have a hard time, right now, accepting that we should bring domesticated reindeer in because of the fact that they would utilize the same area that the caribou are utilizing. We would have a problem with the domestic animals becoming involved in the food source of the caribou herd. I think that bringing in domestic reindeer could become a problem for us if it were allowed to happen. However, if a proposal is made to us we would have to consider it at that time.

**Mr. Porter:** I believe there is a correction of the recordings of the debates at this time. There was some inference that I had advocated the introduction of domestic reindeer to compete with the Porcupine caribou herd for the available forage. I would just like to state that I had not said that and that what I had stated was that, in the eventuality of some catastrophe that would cause the decimation of the Porcupine caribou herd, what would be the government's position in that instance.

On July 21st, 1981, the then Minister of Renewable Resources announced an outfitting policy. In that policy statement he said, "Our information on wildlife population levels in the southern Yukon, the region of highest hunting pressure, is good, but we have not completed gathering comparable information on central or northern Yukon. We cannot establish a reliable quota system without that material".

I would like to ask the present Minister of Wildlife Resources, has there been an updating of the baseline data on wildlife in the particular area of the north and central Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I stated earlier, we are constantly getting additional information and data on the game. The game that we are particularly interested in in northern Yukon at this time are the Porcupine caribou which, I have already said, have increased approximately by 25,000 in the last four or five years; and the grizzly bear, which is an animal that does not reproduce very fast in our northern climate.

We are concerned about those two. We have brought regulations out, specifically on the grizzly bear, with new regulations this year. Because the Porcupine caribou herd is increasing in number and there is no worry about decimating it, we have allowed two caribou to residents this year, as long as one of them comes from the Porcupine caribou herd in game management zone one or two.

So, yes, we are constantly gathering new information and we utilize that information when we do get it.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister answer the question in this way: is he confident that the material that they do have on hand is of a nature reliable enough to put in a quota system for the animals covered within that jurisdiction?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The information that we have on the central and northern grizzly and on the Porcupine caribou herd, yes, we feel, is adequate. We are still doing studies on sheep and other animals in the areas, as we are doing in the southern Yukon. We will never have enough data on all the animals in the Yukon territory, because it is a constant process of gathering more information.

**Mr. Porter:** Can the minister indicate what he considers to be the harvest level, in terms of percentage, that is acceptable by this government for the Porcupine caribou herd?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Right now, it is approximately 2,000 to 2,500 a year and we could easily double that number and still maintain the caribou population. I do not think there is any worry about us, for example, allowing an extra animal to each hunter in the territory, because, in point of fact, very few of them will go up there and get a caribou from the Porcupine caribou herd in the Dempster area, so, we are not concerned.

We do have one concern and that is about the people of the Northwest Territories coming into the Yukon Territory at the northern end of the Dempster and taking a great number of animals.

The concern is not so much the number of animals as to whether they are being utilized properly according to our laws. That is our major concern.

**Mr. Porter:** I place emphasis on the minister's statement that he does not believe that the allowance of an additional caribou to be taken by hunters this coming season will have any effect whatsoever on the Porcupine caribou herd. Should a situation occur where the residents of the Yukon get absolutely hungry to the extent that they travel, in greater numbers than they have in the past, to the Dempster and hunt for the caribou and should they be making representation to the government that the government curtail the present restriction, under the *Area Development Act*, which calls for non-hunting within a five-mile radius of the highway, is the government prepared to bend to any pressure from these people to reduce the present corridor that they have established on the Dempster?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The member is putting hypothetical questions to me now that I am not prepared to answer. Who knows if there is going to be some disaster and some people go up there. You address those questions at that time. As for the Dempster Highway and the corridor, that is something that will be dealt with in a Dempster Highway management plan which I hope we will be dealing with on a public basis within the next month or so. At that time, when we finalize our position on the Dempster Highway, we will then make a decision as to whether we are going to reduce the corridor or remove the corridor out in some areas, or what we are going to do; who knows. That is a decision for the future.

**Mr. Porter:** I would point out the difference between the minister's attitude and my personal attitude to game management. I think that he has stated that his is one that when there is a situation occurring, then you react to it. I would suggest, by the allowance of additional caribou to be taken from a particular herd, that the government, in effect, has created a situation that should call for some planning and management being considered at this point in anticipation of the results of such a decision.

In the July 21st outfitters' policy that was established by this government, there was also a statement to the effect that, beginning in 1982, a quota by species will be negotiated with the outfitters where there is non-resident and resident hunting measures. Can the minister explain to the process by which these negotiations occurred?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all, before I deal with that question, I will deal with the statement of the member opposite. The reason for going out and getting information on game is to utilize it to the best that you can utilize it. There is no sense having five or ten thousand caribou die in the wild if you can utilize them for human food. That is the reason why we have allowed an extra caribou to each hunter. If a disaster happens and everybody is going to the Dempster to shoot caribou, that would have to be assessed at that time. Maybe the answer would be that, yes, they should go and shoot those caribou because we do not want everybody to starve to death.

You handle a situation when it arises. We always have the capability of almost instantaneously putting a restriction on the hunting of any species in the territory if it is necessary. Really, I am glad that the member opposite is not managing the game in the territory.

To deal with the outfitters, we sit down with the outfitters on a biannual basis and discuss everything that we could possibly discuss with them that affects the outfitting industry. We just sat down with them here last week, I believe, and we talked over our new regulations and they expressed some concerns to me. We have tried to resolve some of the issues that they have but, as for individual species, that is something that we will negotiate, and have been negotiating, in order to protect the resources of the Yukon Territory.

This is one of the only areas in the world where hunters go for a total mixed bag of game. A great many hunters in a great many other areas of North America and the world go specifically for one animal or for two animals. Here, if they buy enough tags, they can get every animal that we have in the Yukon Territory. That is something that, perhaps, in the future we should consider reducing

somewhat. Perhaps we should not allow hunters to come here and get a total mixed bag. Perhaps the outfitters should be looking at one or two animals. That is the kind of thing that you talk about and negotiate about.

**Mr. Chairman:** We will now recess until 7:30 p.m.

#### *Recess*

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

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to move on to an entirely different area that we have not yet touched upon, and that is trapping. Aside from the existing normal programs that run out of the department, are there plans for any new initiatives in trapping-related programs?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is a question that I cannot really give a definitive answer to. I am not sure whether the department is working on some new areas with respect to trapping. I would have to take that question under advisement. I am sure that they are, but I could not give the member a definitive answer.

**Mr. Porter:** When the minister does sit down and look at the program area, I would like to know if he would pay particular attention to the area of marketing, with respect to assisting trappers with it. Also, whether or not he sees it as a good idea that the government get into the business of loaning trappers who are in the remote areas of the Yukon, the use of government radios? That is, two-way radios they can use for emergency purposes as this is something that is practised in other jurisdictions. Could the minister answer a question with respect to the establishment of a northern fur auction. It might just not be feasible for the Yukon jurisdiction, but the possibility of a combined Northwest Territories-Alaskan-Yukon system could possibly support such an idea. Has the minister ever thought about it or talked about it with his department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all I would like to say to the member across the floor that we are dealing with general debate and he is asking me specific questions about programs in the department, when I have already stated that if he would like to know about specifics, we should wait until we get to the programs. My department is consistently and constantly trying to make things better for the trappers, for the outfitters and in fact, for everybody who utilizes the resource in the territory. We are doing programs to do with low rain, for example, and harvest analysis, studies about certain areas of the territory where we feel that perhaps trapping should be increased on certain species or decreased on certain species in order to protect some species or make the best use of them. My department has consistently been working with trappers in that regard.

As for a northern fur auction, while I think it is a good idea, I am not sure that we can convince buyers outside of the territory to come to a northern fur auction, because although we do have a fair amount of fur here, it is nothing compared to Ontario or Saskatchewan, and such areas. We would have a fairly tough time convincing the fur buyers to come to the Yukon. I know that that has been put forth on more than one occasion and it has not been successful to date. That is not to say that we would not like to see it happen, but it is very unlikely that it would happen.

**Mr. Porter:** Another area that is an area of possible conflict in respect to the trapping industry is the whole area of agricultural development. I understand, through the processing of agricultural applications the minister's department is asked to screen incoming agricultural applications. What is the process that his department uses in the screening of applications, and what kind of problem areas have they been able to identify with the applications that they have received to date?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** What happens is that someone applies for a piece of land in any certain area of the territory; the Agriculture Development Council asks my department to review it to see if they have any problems with that land being made available for agriculture. At that time, my department would review the application; where the land is, whether it would compete significantly with game in the area. They would make an assessment in their own minds about whether the agricultural utilization of the area would be better than leaving it in the wild and it being used for game. I think a lot of emphasis has been put on agriculture in the

territory and in certain areas certainly agriculture is an excellent idea; but in a lot of cases, you can look at the whole situation and think that perhaps it would be better to leave it in the wild and utilize the moose and the caribou and the small game and perhaps grizzly bear in the area. A grizzly bear is worth anywhere from \$5,000—\$10,000. If you can get one or two of those out of an area in a year, you have to balance that out against what the benefit is to the people in agriculture. They consider all of those things and then they report back to the Agriculture Development Council about what their thoughts are and what their recommendations are. That is basically the way it takes place. In most agricultural applications, it is already in developed areas so usually there is not very much conflict; but if you get into remoter areas, there could be a fair amount of conflict with the game.

**Mr. Porter:** I agree with the minister on one point; it would probably be pretty tough to grow Iowa corn on the north slope of the Yukon. In respect to the possible area of conflict, is the minister contemplating possible legislation to resolve the conflict between the two competing resources?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, it would be absolutely ridiculous for us to bring in legislation. We brought in legislation to provide for the Agriculture Development Council, whose responsibility it is to review the application for agricultural land and take into consideration all of the competing aspects of that land and make a recommendation to the minister and to the cabinet. I believe it would not be in our best interest to draw up legislation to stop that process from happening.

**Mr. Porter:** Would the minister be prepared to look at an amendment to the existing legislation in order to establish very clear guidelines as to the process for the resolution of conflicts between the two resource areas?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We already have very clear guidelines for the Agriculture Development Council which, I think addresses that problem. Probably, at some future date when agriculture becomes more established in the territory, we will get into a little more detail in that regard and it may even become a function of the Renewable Resources Department to look after it. At the present time, because the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs allocates the land in the territory, it was felt it would be best to have it there. All of the competing demands on the land are well addressed before any land is recommended for agricultural land.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to know if the minister has received any requests toward extension of the trapping season for the allowance of live trapping of animals. I would like to know if the minister has any policy in that particular area.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not to the best of my knowledge have we had any requests for extension of the season for live trapping. If that were to happen, I would have to get a report from my department before any decision would be made, and a recommendation from them, as I do not feel qualified to say whether it should or should not be extended.

**Mr. Porter:** Another area of major concern in respect to the wildlife legislation is one of the area of compliance with respect to the constitution of this country. Is the minister of the opinion that the residency clauses of the *Wildlife Act* are in compliance with the constitution or not.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes I do.

**Mr. Porter:** I take it that the minister is saying, yes, that the residency requirements of the *Wildlife Act* as it relates to trapping specifically is in complete agreement with the constitution. One of the particular trappings that experienced some problem was trapline 293. It can be recalled that the government did resolve the issue on a temporary basis. I believe, right now, we have three trappers trapping the line, and that is the line that includes Primrose and Rose Lakes. I was wondering if the minister could give us an indication as to what the future plans are for the use of that particular trapline?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We will most likely be reviewing that in the near future with the idea of giving it out to a trapper who we feel deserves a line, has shown his interest in trapping and has shown us that he is a competent trapper. It looks fairly obvious to me that the son of the trapper who did hold the line is not that interested in

trapping nor, under any circumstances, has he shown that he deserves a line. We will be considering giving it out to some other competent trapper; someone who has, perhaps, had an application in for a line, for perhaps a number of years. We will look at the situation and probably be allocating it sometime this year.

**Mr. Porter:** Has the minister, or anyone in his department, undertaken an assessment of the commercial production of renewable resources? When I say renewable resources, I am thinking specifically of the area of wild game.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Not utilizing wild game for commercial production, but there have been some proposals for fox farms and things like that. We would consider any proposal that was given to us. As far as our going out and doing a study ourselves about whether it would be viable or whether it would not, I think we will leave that up to the private sector. When they come to us with a proposal, we will then look at it and consider it.

**Mr. Porter:** I take it from the minister's answer that there is no existing policy in this particular area. The way in which they are handled is that individuals, or a group of individuals, initiate a proposal, deliver it to the minister and it is looked at on its merits, then policies are developed for that particular proposal?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No. The member has it all wrong. Our policy is, and we have it in the *Wildlife Act*, that fur farming comes under the *Wildlife Act*. If anyone makes a proposal for fur farming, for example, or for raising any type of wild game, that is the responsibility of my department; to assess the value to the territory and the damage that, perhaps, may be done, and the benefit to the territory. At that time, we would make a decision of whether we would agree to go along with it or whether we would not. It would have to be something that we feel would be beneficial; not something that, perhaps, might concern some kind of animal that we do not want to see in this territory, especially if they got loose. We would have to review it before any decision was made. That does not say that we are against fur farming or wildlife growing of any kind, be it elk or bison or whether they want to raise foxes. We would consider every one of them and deal with it on its merit.

**Mr. Porter:** Does the minister support the establishment of a commercial tannery in the Yukon? If so, would he be prepared to look at and review a proposal in this particular area and would he go so far as to look at committing government funds for the establishment of a tannery here in the Yukon?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We would be very interested in a tannery in the Yukon, but what gets me, and I will express this now, is that everyone who wants to start out some business in the territory, especially when it comes to wildlife, thinks that the government should become involved, and that the government should put out the money. What is the matter with the people putting out the money? That is the name of the game: free enterprise. If they have a project that they think can make money, why do they not go to the bank and borrow the money? That is what I do if I want to start a business. That is what anybody else should do. In certain circumstances, it may be beneficial for us to partially fund it or give it a grant or a recoverable loan, but that would be considered at the time we receive the proposal.

**Mr. Porter:** I did not really want a speech on free enterprise; I just wanted to know whether or not the government would consider the provision of any financing for a future tannery. Moving on, we have covered this area earlier with respect to consultation and we did not seem to firmly establish an answer in that area, but I should like to ask the minister, before we leave general debate, if, in the future, when his department has plans for the amendment to *The Wildlife Act*, would he undertake to establish some form of consultation with the public-at-large?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I stated before and I will state it again, but the member across the floor does not seem to comprehend: we do that. We put every one of our proposals for amendment changes to *The Wildlife Act* or changes in the regulations, to the wildlife advisory committee, who represent the public. They are members of the public and they represent every organization in the territory that is interested in wildlife. Now, if that is not satisfactory to the member, I do not really know what he wants. Every one of those

people has the ability to talk with any one of those members of the wildlife advisory committee and put their ideas forward. I think that should be satisfactory.

**Mr. Porter:** In respect to the wildlife advisory board, I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not the minutes of those board meetings are available to the public?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** You would have to talk to the wildlife advisory committee, because I believe they are available but I could not be firm in my own mind; I believe they are.

**Mr. McDonald:** There are a couple of areas that I would like to touch on briefly. The one is agriculture and wildlife conflicts and the other is wildlife farming. Has the minister's department identified any areas which are considered to be sensitive areas in terms of a conflict with agriculture, specifically those traditional farming areas — or traditional in the past; that have shown proven potential in the past, such as the Mayo-Elsa area, the Dawson area, the area immediately around Whitehorse and the area immediately around Watson Lake — whether or not these areas have been identified as being incompatible with agriculture?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Realistically, we have to face up to the fact that even if agriculture is incompatible with wildlife, agriculture will go forward because it seems like man's number one desire is to dig a hole in the ground and start growing something. We have to face the fact that anywhere that we have populated areas, we are going to have people who want to do some type of farming.

We have identified areas in the territory that have more potential areas for farming than others. The Watson Lake area is one good example. The Lake Laberge area around Whitehorse here is another good example. From Carmacks, down the Yukon River to Dawson City is a good agricultural area. There is a little bit in the Mayo area. Other than that, most of the areas in the Yukon are not suitable for agriculture and it is not necessarily because of the competition with wildlife; it is just a fact that the land is not suitable for agricultural purposes.

**Mr. McDonald:** I am a little bit puzzled as to the reasons that the government has expressed for clearing agricultural land applications with renewable resources. If, as the minister has just stated, any conflict will automatically mean that agriculture will win out, because people have a desire to dig holes in the ground and grow things, I am a little puzzled as to why renewable resources would screen these. I am particularly interested in the areas that they consider to be incompatible with agriculture.

As the minister surely knows, there are a few qualifications to any land application, one being that it may conflict with land claims, another that it has to show some good growing potential; there has to be a soil analysis and climatic analysis performed prior to the application being accepted. If the Department of Renewable Resources has identified certain areas that have proven that wildlife has greater worth per se than does agriculture, I am interested in knowing where these areas are. Already, the prospective farmer has to play a guessing game with land claims. Land claims are secret, land selection is secret and he must make application which is an expensive, time-consuming procedure and he has to chance it that, perhaps, this application will not conflict with the land claims.

If there are some areas which the Department of Renewable Resources has identified as having superior value for its renewable resources, I would be interested in hearing what those areas are for the sake of the prospective farmer, if for no one else.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** There are a great many areas that are better for renewable resources and even some areas that are good agricultural land. For example, in the Watson Lake area, there is more agricultural land than anywhere else in the territory. If there was an application made for a piece of agricultural land way out in the middle of the boonies, in the Watson Lake area, I am very confident my department would go to the Agriculture Development Council and say that we do not think they should go there; not only because there is wildlife all around in the area, but because agriculture should be developed on an orderly basis as well as anything else. Once we allow the agricultural pursuit to go on, the next thing we get is, "get the wolves away from my horses", or "get the bears out of my field and away from my cows". What we have to do is balance all of those requests we know we are going to



get in a very short period of time against the best bet that the existing wildlife would mean to us. So even though Watson Lake, for example, is a good agricultural area, there should be orderly development. It should be development that gradually spreads out into the hinterlands. It should not be a piece of land one place and another twenty miles over and up. That is where we are going to have the biggest problem.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would like to say at the outset that I entirely agree with the Minister of Renewable Resources. However, the selection procedure for the prospective farmer is, in the policy which the minister for agriculture has stated, or has elicited in this House, not necessarily compatible with the formulation that the Minister of Renewable Resources has just given. Now, the Agriculture Development Council has just said that it would openly entertain any application for agricultural land anywhere in the territory — the Bonnet Plume, any place — and should the farmer have resources, should the land and the soil be compatible with growing, then they would entertain these applications. If the Minister of Renewable Resources is saying that in some cases the boonies are considered to be incompatible with agriculture, then this poses a serious problem for people who are out looking for agricultural land.

This is actually rather a serious problem, because the sucker farmer is labouring under the misapprehension that perhaps some land will be gainfully entertained by the Agricultural Development Council no matter where it is. It may be the boonies around Watson Lake. Now, I do agree that we have to develop agriculture on an orderly basis. I would simply like, however, a simple statement as to how these two departments intertwine. Are applications going to be entertained any place in the territory? Are there areas that are being identified now, or that have been identified, which are considered to be incompatible with agriculture because they are remote, and if so, where are these particular areas of land? I think this is very important because already the prospective farmer has to do a lot of searching in order to find land, and he has to play a bit of a guessing game when it comes to various other factors, including the land claim selection. It is important that we get a clear statement from either one or both ministers — the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Renewable Resources — of what the situation actually is so that the prospective farmer is not put to a lot of useless trouble to identify a particular piece of land.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I will answer part of that and then I think the minister responsible for agriculture should answer the other part. I think that the Agriculture Development Council is most likely taking a very adult idea of attitude about agricultural development in the territory. If anyone does put an application in, yes, they do consider it because that is their responsibility. Whether they would give a piece of land in the Bonnet Plume area for agriculture, I would doubt very much. For agricultural development in the territory, other than for their own personal use, going and farming in the Bonnet Plume would be absolutely ridiculous and ludicrous. Although they would consider it, I think that any thinking person, who was interested in the agricultural pursuit perhaps as a business, would not even consider it. While they do have an obligation to review every one and make a decision I think it would be absolutely crazy for anyone to think they would give land in the Bonnet Plume area for agriculture. Now in the Watson Lake or Dawson City or perhaps even the Mayo area, that might be taken into consideration. Then all of the other down sides of it would have to be considered before they would give the land out. I would let the Minister of Agriculture speak about the Agriculture Development Council and what they would do.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I did not realize I was going to get into this debate. I thought I fully explained this situation to the member opposite. I would expect that when he is goes through *Hansard*, he would refresh his memory.

As far as applications for new areas are concerned, they are definitely entertained but the first impediment is the Government of Canada as to whether or not it is going to be a land transfer if we concurred that that land should be used for that particular purpose. Also, the areas being applied for are sent over to the Department of Renewable Resources to find out if there is any conflict. If there is,

then that particular advice is brought forward to the Agriculture Development Council, and that aids and abets the Agriculture Development Council in looking at applications. Perhaps, if they do not concur with the land use conflict that becomes apparent, then they can redirect the individual in question to, perhaps, someplace else as opposed to the area that he or she initially applied for. I think it is a rational approach. I concur with the Minister of Renewable Resources; it would be ridiculous to have somebody on top of the mountaintop of Bonnet Plume going under the pretext of farming. That is not the idea or the purpose of the Agriculture Development Council, to let land loose for the purposes of settling an immediate need. The idea is to try to set up a system that is going to be successful for not only the industry but, just as importantly, the individual in question.

**Mr. McDonald:** It seems to me that we have some serious trouble here. I did not realize that we would be faced with this at this time. Both the ministers seem to be taking it as an article of faith that people will apply for land in the traditional areas. However, they have promised to actively entertain any land applications anywhere else, provided that they meet with the requirements that were made public today in the papers that the minister for agriculture presented in the House. I do not know if the minister for agriculture realizes this but the Bonnet Plume is not made up solely of mountain peaks. There are valleys in the Bonnet Plume which may have agricultural potential. If this government is suggesting that any land which meets the technical qualifications for being agriculture, if they are entertaining applications for lands on those assumptions, then they quite conceivably could be receiving applications for land outside the traditional agricultural areas.

This is rather serious. The minister for agriculture suggests that perhaps the people who make application can quite easily be directed elsewhere should their application not meet the standards set by the various departments. This, I reiterate, is a costly effort; to identify a piece of land that a person would like to use for agricultural purposes. It is time consuming, and it can be costly to identify this land. It is not simply a matter of sitting down with a person and suggesting that he go elsewhere. That may be the end result. Nevertheless, people spend a lot of time identifying a piece of land: they have to satisfy themselves that they want this particular piece of land. They are being led by this government to believe they can take land so long as it technically meets certain qualifications anywhere in the territory; perhaps a beautiful meadow in the Bonnet Plume someplace, which is near water, meets climatic factors, and they would just like to be off by themselves in the wild, growing plants, or a couple of dairy cows.

The Minister of Agriculture suggests that the renewable resources department decides whether or not there are conflicts with wildlife in order to screen agricultural land applications. All I am asking is what areas they have identified as being more suitable for wildlife, where wildlife has greater economic potential than does agriculture, and if they have identified these areas I would like to know about them because I think it is important that the prospective farmer realize that these areas are, for all intents and purposes, out of bounds.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** First of all, I would like to clear up one thing. If anyone applied for land in the Bonnet Plume, regardless of whether it had agriculture potential or not — which I would very much doubt, as I have been in the Bonnet Plume area on more than one occasion, and it is either mountain tops or gravel flats and it is not very likely that anyone would want agricultural land there — the number one consideration is: we are talking about agricultural land as a pursuit, as a business; we are not talking about agricultural land that somebody wants to grow their own potatoes on, or whatever. That is a different thing altogether. We are talking about agricultural land for agricultural production for sale to the public. We are talking about farming, not a little 20 acre section of land somewhere. Even at that, they probably would not get it in the Bonnet Plume area.

Regardless of where the agricultural land is, as I stated earlier, even it was in the Watson Lake area, it might be agricultural land, it might have agricultural potential, but it would still have to be reviewed by my department and we would perhaps say that we do

not think they should go there even though it has agricultural potential; all they are going to do is conflict with the wildlife in that area which is, at the present time, much more beneficial than some little farm out in the middle of the boonies would be.

So, even though it would be an agricultural area, it might be that my department would make a recommendation that it not be given out as agricultural land. That is not to say that it is not agricultural land. Any land that is not agricultural land would be identified as soil not suitable and, in that case, well, there is not even any argument about it; it is better for the use of wildlife. As I stated earlier, one or two grizzly bears in certain areas are worth a lot more than perhaps any farming that could go on in that area. We do not have to identify specific areas as not suitable for wildlife. What we have to do is identify specific areas where agricultural pursuits should be carried on and then we should have orderly growth. That is what we are talking about, around Whitehorse, down the river or in the Watson Lake area, where they can spread out and gradually take up the agricultural land.

We are not trying to identify areas that are more suitable for wildlife. What we are trying to do is have orderly agricultural growth.

**Mr. McDonald:** Again, I would like to substantially agree with most of what the minister had to say, however, the minister should get together with the minister for agriculture and hammer out a policy because I think either one or both of the ministers might be embarrassed by what they seem to be saying. The minister for renewable resources has just said that farming, in his mind, counts as something where produce is sold to the public. This, of course, rules out hobby farming, most of market gardening for private purposes which, I believe, the Agriculture Development Council is entertaining applications for, and it rules out where the person has a few horses and some oats for their own private purposes.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** On a point of order. It is my understanding that the debate was the preamble to the renewable resources clause-by-clause discussion on the votes before us. It would seem to me that the discussion is getting almost repetitive in view of the fact that a number of things that were just said here were said during the debate over municipal affairs, which contains the vote for the Agriculture Development Council.

**Mr. McDonald:** On the same point of order. First of all, I could correct the minister for agriculture. A lot of what is being said right now has nothing to do with what was said during the debate on agriculture. On this point of order, I believe we are talking about the conflict between wildlife and agriculture. We are talking about the rationale for the screening of agricultural land by renewable resources; the scrutiny of agricultural land applications for conflicts with wildlife.

**Mr. Chairman:** If the member for Mayo can continue to show us that he can relate the two subjects, I will allow this to continue. I would like to remind him that we definitely are on renewable resources.

**Mr. McDonald:** I have not diverted from the debate at hand, at all. As I said, we are talking about the conflict between wildlife and agriculture and about the reasons which the Department of Renewable Resources presents as those which would prevent an agricultural land application being accepted due to a wildlife conflict. I think that was the strain of my particular debate and I think that the Minister of Renewable Resources was maintaining that same strain.

To continue, the minister said that we should identify areas where agricultural pursuits would be productive. I would like to know, in terms of his own department, where he feels agriculture pursuits would be paramount over wildlife resources, for example.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I thought I made that plain already. I have already stated in the Lake Leberge area, where there is quite a bit of agriculture going on already, that would be an area we would consider. If somebody wanted to go into the Ibex, for example, and stake 40 acres of land to run his little hobby farm on, we would say no. We do not want to see it there. It would interfere with sheep in that area, for example. It might be some other area that is breeding grounds for lynx, or who knows what it is. Generally, the area around Lake Leberge is an agricultural area. The area around

Watson Lake is an agricultural area. As I said, down the river from Carmacks to Dawson City is a good agricultural area. On the Stewart River, there are good agricultural areas.

Those would be considered, but even though they are good agricultural areas, they might get a recommendation that they should not go in there for the type of agriculture that they want to put in there, because there is too much conflict with the wildlife and it would not be advantageous for us to allow those people to go in there.

Once you have allowed them to go in there, the next thing you are faced with is the protection that they want. They want protection from the bears or the wolves or whatever. All those things have to be taken into consideration. It is not a case of picking areas out and saying they are not suitable for agriculture. It is a case of saying whether the agriculture that is proposed for that area is worth more to us than what it is already producing, which is the wildlife.

**Mr. McDonald:** I would like the minister to elaborate a little bit on what he means by agricultural projects being worth more to us. I would like to know what he means by "us". On another point, I think it is necessary to mention that a particular piece of land may conflict with wildlife, but this is not the same as saying that it has poor climatic and soil conditions. Many prospective farmers in the territory do not have the knowledge that the minister claims that his department has regarding the value of wildlife in the territory; I would like to know if they have identified any areas which the department could show to a prospective farmer to tell the farmer that these areas are considered to be off limits because his department feels that the wildlife resource is more valuable than any possible agricultural resource on that particular piece of land.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am going to quit arguing about this subject because it is just going around and around and around and I do not think we are getting anywhere. My department tells the Agriculture Development Council when land is referred to them. The Agriculture Development Council has, in consultation with my department, identified some areas in the territory where they believe agriculture should go in. If anyone in the territory should say these are the areas in which we would encourage agricultural development, it should be the Agriculture Development Council. I believe that they do that. Regardless of whether they do or whether they do not, anyone who is applying for land in the territory should consider where he is going and what the costs are going to be, and the costs to us, as far as agriculture goes and renewable resources; just the fact that we have to go out and destroy one grizzly bear. For example, to protect a farmer who has two cows, because a grizzly bear is attacking his cows, and we have to destroy a grizzly bear that is worth ten times as much as the cows are worth, I would say that it is a bad investment for us to allow agriculture in that area. We have to have orderly growth. I do not know what more information the member across the floor needs.

**Mr. McDonald:** I guess I cannot expect anything more from the minister regarding this issue. The minister has clearly said that his department does not identify land on which the wildlife resources are more valuable than the agriculture resource. I think that that is only going to mean that the farmers' guessing game is going to be expanded from land claims to wildlife potential before he actually gets his application into the Agriculture Development Council; I think that is a sorry state of affairs.

The other area I would like to explore, as we seem to have exhausted this particular one, is the area of wildlife herding. I would like to know, briefly, from the minister, how a person would go about applying for land to engage in this sort of pursuit.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** As I have stated earlier, he would have to put together a proposal and he would have to give it to my department. We would then assess that proposal and make a recommendation to the cabinet as to whether we should make land available for that pursuit. We would have to take wildlife into consideration. Fur farming would be a little different but something in the neighbourhood of elk ranching or raising bison; there are specific areas of the territory where that could perhaps be done. We would have to have that proposal. We are not going out there and identifying areas where this pursuit could take place. It is up to the people to come and tell us what they would like to see and justify to



us that it is a viable operation.

**Mr. McDonald:** For my own clarification, is the minister saying that all fur farming and wildlife grazing applications that were made to his department would not have anything to do with the Agriculture Development Council?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is right.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to enter the debate in order to clarify certain points. I had originally intended to enter the debate a long time ago, but a number of the points I intended to address were addressed, in a general sense, in perhaps a different way. I would like to pursue the whole line of questioning, but to be more specific about the policies that the minister is following.

I have two questions and I will ask them both at once. The first one requires a little bit of a preamble in that I was amazed in November when the minister talked about non-renewable resources and the fact that if a mine were going to go into an area, the non-renewable resource development would take precedence over the renewable area. I objected at that time to the Minister of Renewable Resources expressing that sort of point of view.

Today, the minister has talked about agricultural development in the territory and has expressed a point of view that agricultural development ought to occur in an orderly way which, of course, is a general statement that very few would disagree with.

However, the general question is: in assessing the priorities and in balancing the various considerations concerning renewable and non-renewable resource development and agricultural and wildlife development, who is advocating the position of the renewable resource in the territory, and is it in fact this minister who is advocating that position in coming to the balance decisions? That is the first question. To rephrase it, does this minister see his duty or his responsibility in this portfolio as advocating the maintenance of renewable wildlife resources or as advocating something else which he perceives may be more advantageous to the territory?

The second question is also a very, very general question and it follows the line of questioning that has occurred in the last 45 minutes or so. Obviously, wildlife maintenance or conservation and the maintenance of the dependant industries (e.g. outfitting and tourism to a certain extent) is a very, very important consideration. Also, agriculture is a very important consideration and obviously in some places in the territory the interests conflict. As population pressures increase and the development of the territory increases, the conflict can be expected to increase. I ask the minister this: in the very long term — and I am not talking about two years or five years; I am talking about 20 years or 100 years from now — is there a policy planning process whereby the minister's department identifies certain areas of the Yukon where the wildlife interest ought to be paramount or supreme or of the first priority? The federal government is establishing parks of various kinds in the various parts of the Yukon.

My specific second question is: is the minister's department planning for the establishment of Yukon wildlife parks anywhere in the territory at all?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Well, I would like to take it from the beginning. First of all, he tried to put the words in my mouth that I said that non-renewable resources should take precedence over renewable resources. I did not say that at all. I said, and I maintain it, and I said it since I was a little kid and I will say it til the day I die, my understanding of conservation is the wise use and management of resources. You utilize your resources for the optimum benefit of the people. If the optimum benefit is that we develop the non-renewable resources and extract them and then look after the land and leave the land in a state that renewable resources, especially game, can be reintroduced to or allowed to reintroduce themselves to, then I believe the extraction of non-renewable resources is of the most benefit to us. My interpretation of conservation, I suppose, is a great deal different from that of a lot of people, especially the members across the floor, obviously, who think that the word conservation means preservation; that is not my concept of the word conservation. My department is the department that puts the position of the wildlife forward. That is what the Department of Renewable Resources is all about, and I agree with it totally. I think we have an obligation to protect the

wildlife in the territory as much as possible, using the wisest management and conservation of our wildlife. Yes, my department does do that.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The gist of the second question is: is the department planning at all for Yukon wildlife parks?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, we have prepared for Yukon wildlife. We have put proposals to the federal government on numerous occasions for territorial parks. The territorial parks that are proposed are parks that can be utilized for any purpose, for the conservation of wildlife, for the extraction of resources; anything that the government feels should go on or can go on in a territorial park. The beauty of our concept of a territorial park is that we can have conservation in those areas; we can protect the wildlife where it is beneficial to protect the wildlife. If it is more benefit to extract some non-renewable resource in that area than the wildlife at that particular time, then that could be done also. Our opinion is that territorial parks are a lot more benefit to the territory than national parks would be because we can utilize the resources for the optimum benefit of the people.

**Mr. Chairman:** We will recess until 8:40.

#### *Recess*

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

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Before the break, I was interested in parks. What is the state of the negotiations or development concerning the first Yukon wildlife parks?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We have not identified any specific area as a Yukon wildlife park. We have identified areas such as the Firth River, which for years we wanted as a park in order to protect not only the beautiful scenery but the breeding grounds of the caribou. There are other areas that we have identified such as Kusawa Lake and Millhaven Bay and a few others such as that for territorial parks for various reasons. There are areas where we have identified game sanctuaries; one game sanctuary that is in the centre of the territory now, the MacArthur game sanctuary. It is one area that we would consider as a territorial park. There are numerous areas in the territory that we have identified. I believe the number is 26, or something like that. Some of them would be to protect the wildlife in the area. Although we have not identified any specifically just to protect wildlife, we have identified numerous potential territorial parks where one of the functions would be to protect wildlife.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I believe that this is a constructive area. I say that because I was aware, as the minister was — I am absolutely positive — of some controversy in the last few weeks concerning the identification of areas of the Yukon by "outside experts" — of certain specific areas of the Yukon — requiring protection. I am interested to know that the minister's department has already identified 26 areas for potential park sites for various purposes. It is obvious to me that, in the face of the identification by the federal authorities and by outside authorities of various sorts or areas of the Yukon for parks, if we, as Yukoners, feel that we can do a better job, the best response to those people is to say that we live here, we know the area and we have identified these particular areas for these particular purposes.

In the past months and years, I have looked for that kind of statement from the government here. I am interested in the development of negotiations. I suppose they are federal-territorial negotiations and the government leader may be involved in them in an important way. I am interested in the state of the territorial planning for these kinds of parks. Could the minister further elaborate on the following questions? Of the 26 areas, what kinds of parks are identified? The minister indicated that not all of them are wildlife parks; some of them are other kinds of parks. What are the categories of parks that the Yukon government is looking at? That is the first question. The second question is: what is the state of the negotiation with the federal government in order to achieve these parks? The third question is: what is the state of the Yukon publicity and the Yukon negotiation concerning any possible competing interests in these 26 areas?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** If the member across the floor would read

the *Parks Act*, he would see that the territorial park does not necessarily have to be designated for any purpose. Under our territorial *Parks Act*, any park that we have could be used for any purpose. There would be a management plan made for the park area, and the park would be managed according to the management plan. That is in the existing parks legislation. We have identified specific areas, like Fort Selkirk, for a territorial historic park. We have identified areas such as the Coal River Hotsprings as a park for protection of very significant natural water springs and the resulting development that has taken place because of the limestone formations. We have identified other areas such as Kusawa for territorial parks, not only for campgrounds, but for viewing of game, for protection of game, and also, if there was a mine in the area, for example, it might be developed. It depends on which is the most beneficial for the territory.

There are other areas, as I have already stated, such as the Firth River, that has been proposed for years and years as a park, not only to protect the beautiful scenery but also the breeding grounds of the caribou. There are numerous different reasons why we have chosen these areas as parks. There are other areas we are considering as territorial parks for the protection of birds; migrating waterfowl or even the birds that are here on a year round basis. They all come under our territorial *Parks Act*, and a management plan has to be drawn up for them, exactly the same as a national park.

The federal government knows we want them, yes. We have tried for many years to get them. In fact, before this government was elected there were applications in for land, so it is not that they do not know that we want them and it is not that they do not know that we want to protect them. The problem is the federal government does not want to hand the land over to us. Outside interests now think that they know how to run the territory better than we do; that we are a bunch of dummies up here and we cannot figure out what is the best for us. I am here to say that I think that we can and we have shown it a great many times over.

We now have our *Land Planning Act*, which also allows us to take an area of the territory, any region of the territory, and plan it. Perhaps in that plan there might be one or two areas where we want a territorial park to protect something, such as a natural sight or the game in the area. That is something that would be addressed under our land planning process.

I think we have all the mechanisms set up; they are already there, they are in place. All we have to have is agreement from the federal government to allow us to go ahead and do it.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I thank the minister for that information and I would like to paraphrase or rephrase it and ask the minister that if I am wrong in my interpretation of what he just said, to correct me. I asked if there were categories of parks and for the purposes of these various parks at the 26 identified areas that he had talked about. As I analyzed the answer, I got four categories, and I will ask the minister to correct me if I am wrong. I realize *The Territorial Parks Act* does not require a specific purpose, but the minister correctly identified, I believe, the requirement for a management plan and I agree with the statements about management plans. The four areas, as I analyze them, are: historical parks, such as the Fort Selkirk site; geographical areas — this is an area of geographical interest such as a cold spring or a hot spring or a peculiar geographical configuration — a tourism area to be used for camping or for its scenic interest to tourists, and a wildlife park, which could be for either game or for birds, but a wildlife park.

I identify four general areas. I would ask the minister to correct me if I am wrong, and also to identify for me any additional areas if I have missed any. That kind of information, I submit, is very, very useful to the Yukon public because, as the member for Mayo indicated a little while ago, there are members of the public who are interested in land who do not wish to know the various considerations that the Cabinet or the various councils or the various ministers are going through in considering the allocation of land. These kinds of statements are very useful to them.

After identifying the various kinds of potential territorial parks, I would ask if the minister has made known to the federal government any master plan for territorial parks sponsored by this

government? I make that question a very serious one because I am aware of the initiatives of the federal people and, indeed, other people, to attempt to plan Yukon's land and I am in general agreement with the principle that the best planning is going to be done by the people who live here. As we are the people who live here, I would ask the minister: what has the department done to communicate those plans to the federal government?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I do not mind answering questions, but I do not like my answers all repeated to me. I think there is no necessity for it. First of all, I identified four areas; there could be 40 areas. Whatever is significant in that area we would identify for a territorial park. They are identified for specific reasons because we want to protect whatever is there or utilize it for the benefit of the territory. The member across the floor knows that as well as I do. He does not have to ask those questions, and I am not prepared to sit here and itemize areas that we would consider. It would be whatever is significant to the people. About his argument that it is beneficial for everybody to know that, I think everybody does know it. He said it before when we were going through the *Parks Act*. As for identifying areas to the federal government, I already stated that, yes, we had done so and we will continue to do so.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** In the 1983-84 budget year, what are the plans of the government to publicize those management plans for Yukon parks?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We have no intention to publicize the management plans for Yukon parks until we reach a settlement with the federal government that makes the land available to us to develop those parks.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Let us go back a step then. What plans has the government got to negotiate with the federal government for achieving those parks?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I think that is a question that I do not have to answer. I think any thinking person would know what the answer is.

**Mr. Porter:** I would like to address a question to the minister in respect to the issue of training. On April 20, 1982 the former minister of Renewable Resources was asked a question as to whether or not he favoured the training of native conservation officers and the minister, of course, answered in the affirmative, being the likable, capable and understanding minister that he was at the time, that he did favour a program of induction of native people into the area of conservation. I would like to ask this minister if he also takes the position that he favours the training, and recruitment of native people in the area of conservation?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I am in favour of training anyone in this territory who is interested in the conservation field, regardless of whether he is white or native.

**Mr. Porter:** In the agreement-in-principle that was reached in respect to the area of trapping and hunting, there is provision for the training of native people, particularly, in this field. The onus to undertake the training was this government's. Can the minister inform me as to exactly what steps have been taken to comply with that agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** That is not an agreement, it is only an agreement-in-principle. When the final agreement is signed, we will be ready to address it at that time.

**Mr. Porter:** A very interesting answer. Is the minister stating that this government will not comply to agreements signed to the agreement-in-principle stage; that they will only comply with the provisions of responsibilities as are in those agreements only at such time as those agreements have been given the assent of Parliament?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** The member for Campbell knows full well that those are, in fact, agreements that are signed with the object of getting them into an agreement-in-principle. Specific agreements that have been agreed to, and that were agreed to prior to them being signed, are being implemented and we are meeting every obligation that we have and we have not negated a single one of them; not one, not ever. We intend to continue meeting our obligations. I will not abide implications from the member for Campbell that we are not meeting our obligations with respect to those agreements.

**Mr. Porter:** With respect to the land claims agreement that was signed with respect to this particular area of training of native people in the area of conservation, can the minister tell this House whether or not the compliance on the part of this government as a party to those agreements, was only after those agreements were signed into law as recognized by Parliament, or, was that agreement written in such a fashion that it did call upon this government to institute training programs prior to that old agreement being signed into law?

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** Those agreements are, in fact, confidential at the insistence of the Council for Yukon Indians and they will remain so, in this House, as long as the Council for Yukon Indians insist that they be confidential. I am not going to breach the confidentiality of those agreements, or land claims negotiations, to answer such a question.

**Mr. Porter:** The hunting, fishing and trapping agreement is a public agreement. It is the first and only agreement that has been made public.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Regardless of whether the agreements are public or not, they are not agreements until the agreement has been finalized. They are only agreements-in-principle, and when the agreement is finalized, that is when they come into effect. We are instituting a great many things that are in those agreements. As I said to the member across the floor, it would be of great benefit to us if, at the same time, the native people would live up to the other side of the agreement, which would mean that they would come to the laws of general application in the territory and they would not exercise their right to kill whatever they want at any time of the year. It would be of great benefit to us and, incidentally, to the members across the floor, if we could manage the game and if they would live up to that other side of the agreement. I think that we, on this side of the floor, are living up to the agreements a great deal more than the other parties who signed the agreements-in-principle.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would take issue with the last sentence that the minister stated about YTG living up to "a great deal more than the other side". I would like to state, for the record, for the benefit of the debate, that I believe that I am the only surviving member of the wildlife select committee of the last Legislature. There were discussions in public concerning that agreement and the wildlife legislation. It is absolutely clear that the wildlife agreement-in-principle is subject to an overall agreement on land claims. The minister and government leader are correct in that respect in that there can be no absolutely legally binding requirement on any party until there is a land claims settlement in general.

<sup>21</sup> However, the member for Campbell also has a very significant point when he talks about that particular agreement, which was substantially made public and which clearly states that there was to be training for native people; this was to occur within 12 months of the signing of the agreement, and I ask the minister this question — it is a very carefully worded question and relates to the estimates in a specific way, regardless of the agreement: even if, God forbid, there is never an agreement-in-principle with regard to land claims, does the minister agree or not that there should be a training program for native people with regard to conservation measures and the possibility of native people acquiring an increased role in this department under a one-government system?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I answered that question already. I said yes, I am in favour of training; not only for the native people but for white people as well. I believe that for anyone who is interested in wildlife management in the territory, if we can, we should try to provide that education to them.

#### **On Administration**

**Mr. Porter:** What happened to the rest, Mr. Chairman?

**Mr. Chairman:** To the whiches?

**Mr. Porter:** Should we not continue to debate page 230?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, ....

**Hon. Mr. Pearson:** We have debated that for the last two-and-a-half hours or so; I do not know where the member for Campbell has been, but that is where we have been, collectively.

**Mr. Chairman:** We are on page 232, under the heading administration.

**Mr. Porter:** The question obviously relates to where are the areas of increase in this particular department?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The only increase is that we have gone from the nine-day to the 10-day fortnight, which is pretty well all the increase in the department.

**Mr. Porter:** That is a lot of personnel; is that simply taking into consideration the increases that were allowed under the constraints legislation in terms of salary provisions?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, there are nine person-years in administration. If the member across the floor does a little calculating, he would find that nine person-years increased from a nine-day to a 10-day fortnight would be a significant increase.

<sup>22</sup> **Mr. Kimmerly:** Looking at the information under Allotments, I see that personnel has a seven percent increase or, in dollar terms, approximately \$23,000. However, the other category has an increase of approximately \$74,000 and 38 percent. What makes up the increase to \$74,000 under the category Other?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** The Other deals with various things such as telephone, the wildlife advisory committee, photocopier rentals, seals and permits, office supplies and equipment, computer services, and publications such as the trapping publications, for example, the one that we just released today dealing with the recipes for the use of bear meat. All of these is Other. As far as the seven percent increase in personnel, I think the members across the floor should also recognize the fact that we have merit increases as well as increases in salaries.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Would the minister be kind enough to give the dollar figure under the various categories that he just mentioned? I know it is available to him. I am specifically interested in computer services.

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Computer services is \$8,500. A lot of that is used in computerization of the resources that, in our studies, we put all of the resources on the computer system so that it is instantly recallable at any future date, so that we can refer to the computer to get the information on any region of the territory that we have to study.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** Is that \$8,500 a total figure or an increase over last year, and is it a chargeback in any way to Government Services?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, that is a total and that is not a chargeback to Government Services.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** What are the dollar figures under the other categories you mentioned?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I hope we are not going to go through this budget with me giving every dollar figure for everything in the budget, because we are going to be here for an awful long time. Telephone charges, \$14,500; Publications, \$24,000; Wildlife Advisory Committee, \$10,000; Photocopier rental, \$10,000; Seals and permits, et cetera, \$25,000; Office supplies and equipment, \$25,000.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** The office equipment at \$25,000 strikes me as a large amount. Is that consistent with other years or is there an increase there?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Yes, it is fairly consistent with other years.

#### <sup>23</sup> **Administration in the amount of \$613,000 agreed to On Resource Planning and Management**

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** This department has 23 employees and is responsible for obtaining all of the data for the territory, and it is also the area where the wolf study is found. It does all of the study regarding parks, small game and big game; any of the technical study work that is done is done under this branch.

**Mr. Porter:** Earlier this fall a status Indian person in Teslin was approached by a conservation officer and had a bear skin that he had in his possession confiscated by the conservation officer. When the man asked as to why the bear skin was taken, the conservation officer stated that he had not comply with sections of the *Game Act* that called upon him to report a nuisance bear in the eventuality of endangering one's life. However, section 17.3 of the *Yukon Act* states that aboriginal peoples, Indians and Eskimos, have the right to hunt any species of game anywhere in the Yukon for their own consumptive use. I believe the minister, just today, issued a recipe book for the handling, curing and subsequent consumption of

bear meat. Does the minister not agree that that status Indian person, with the protection of 17.3, has the ability to hunt a grizzly bear for subsistence purposes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** Number one, these hides were taken from this gentleman in Teslin. They claim that they shot the bear for subsistence use and they had eaten part of it. That does not change the fact that they do not eat the bear hide, and subsistence use of a bear hide is not to have it for sale and that is what they wanted to do with it; sell it. There was a complete investigation done on it, and a legal opinion sought, and the legal opinion was that we should keep the hides. That is why we have done it.

**Mr. Porter:** In asking the following question I would like to obtain, from the minister, a statement of policy in this area. As a result of the precedent that will flow from this case, is it safe to say that it is the policy of this government that in instances where game such as bears are taken for subsistence purposes that the hides of those animals will be confiscated by this government?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, that is not the policy. We will review every situation and make a decision. In this case, the decision was made that we should retain the hides because there was some question of doubt about whether the animals were taken for subsistence purposes.

**Mr. Porter:** The legal opinion that you received from, obviously, the people whom you employ in the area of justice, do you consider to take precedence over the sections provided in 17(3) of the *Yukon Act* which enables aboriginal people to hunt for subsistence purposes?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We have a legal department and their sole function is to give us legal advice. We are complying with that legal advice because we pay them to give us that legal advice. If we did not comply with their legal advice, it would be kind of senseless to have them on our payroll. If the member across the floor, or the two native people involved, want to go to court and settle it in court, we are prepared to do that.

**Mr. Kimmerly:** I would like to make a comment in this area about the question. If the minister wishes to respond, I certainly welcome him to. In my very short, or small number of years in the north, I have observed this kind of controversy fairly frequently, not only in one case. The controversy is that if the game officers seize something, whether it is horns or hide or meat or whatever, and there is no charge laid, there are very, very intense public feelings about that process. The minister has spoken about legal opinions and the minister has used the phrase "our investigation showed us". Obviously, the department has made an investigation and has received an opinion and a decision was made on the grounds of the investigation and the opinion.

I say to the minister, and I make this as a comment, that it may be that the minister is satisfied with an investigation and an opinion but the person who lost the hide, horns, meat or whatever is generally not satisfied. Most often, the community involved is very well aware of the specific incident. In my experience, most often the community is not satisfied. If an investigation is done and the minister acts on the investigation, I would recommend it to him that a court application would do a great deal to publicize within the community the particular concerns involved — the particular issues involved — and would allow a decision-making process on very well-founded rules and procedures which the community, I am sure, would more readily accept.

There are several incidences that I can think of arising in the last year or two about the procedure of game officers seizing various things, usually hides and occasionally other things.

These actions by game officers are extremely controversial and are a thorn in the side of the community, very, very frequently. I recommend to the minister that, where things are seized, a court application actually occur. It is legally possible and it would do a great deal to justify or review the procedure in the community sense.

**Mr. Porter:** Seeing that we have stripped the hide off the issue now and are down to the bare facts, I would like to continue with the minister in this area and ask him a question in respect to the sections of the *Game Act* that call for the individuals who harvest bear to bring in certain parts of the bear's anatomy, and he knows which parts those are. I observed a couple of cases in the area of

Watson Lake in which the conservation officer had denied individuals the necessary permits that would enable them to sell the hides because of the fact they did not bring in those parts of the bear's body that are called for in the *Wildlife Act*. In many instances, Indian people see these acts as a desecration of the bear's spirit, if you will, and see this as in direct violation of what they consider to be their spiritual values and the cultural values they share. In respect of this conflict, would this government be prepared to amend that part of the *Wildlife Act* which concerns the compliance of the hunters to bring in those parts of the bear's anatomy?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** No, we would not be prepared to consider it, and I am surprised to hear that from the member across the floor; the same member who, ten minutes ago, was asking us if we would live up to our side of the agreements-in-principle and now he is asking us to even change our laws so that the native people do not even have to live up to the existing laws. I find it hard to believe that the member across the floor can find a way to get both of these opinions working together in his own mind.

**Mr. Porter:** Let me put the question directly to the minister: does he place any value on the cultural respects that Indian people have for wildlife and does he not agree that, in areas where there is conflict occurring between the cultural values of Indian people in respect to the desecration of game, this is indeed substantial grounds for the amendment of the existing legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Tracey:** I cannot agree with the member opposite, under any circumstances. As for the game department not turning over the hides for resale because of their value, there is a law in effect that, in order for us to conserve the game, especially grizzly bears, we have to have that information. The only way we are going to get that information is if the people who shoot the bears have to bring us the information. We have put it in law so that we can get the information to carry out the management of wildlife in the territory, for the benefit of those people who are using the resource. They have as much responsibility to bring it in as any other person in the territory.

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** Mr. Chairman, I move that you report progress on Bill 5.

*Motion agreed to*

**Hon. Mr. Lang:** I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the chair.

*Motion agreed to*

*Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair*

**Mr. Speaker:** I 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 5, *The Second Appropriation Act, 1983-84* 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?

**Hon. Mrs. Firth:** I move the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Hon. Minister of Education that the House do now adjourn.

*Motion agreed to*

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

*The House adjourned at 9:29 p.m.*

**The following Legislative Return was tabled May 2, 1983: 83-3-25**

Taxation of Northern Benefits (Pearson); W.Q. No. 11

**The following Sessional Paper was tabled May 2, 1983: 83-3-15**

**Criteria used for approving agricultural applications; Agreement for Sale of Land form (Lang); (In response to MPP No. 2, April 13, 1983)**