



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 39

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Monday, May 26, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West	Government Leader. Minister responsible for: Executive Council Office; Finance; Economic Development; Mines and Small Business; Public Service Commission
Hon. Dave Porter	Watson Lake	Government House Leader. Minister responsible for: Tourism; Renewable Resources.
Hon. Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre	Minister responsible for: Justice; Government Services.
Hon. Piers McDonald	Mayo	Minister responsible for: Education; Community and Transportation Services.
Hon. Margaret Joe	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for: Health and Human Resources; Women's Directorate.

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

Willard Phelps	Leader of the Official Opposition Hootalinqua
Bill Brewster	Kluane
Bea Firth	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East
Alan Nordling	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Doug Phillips	Whitehorse Riverdale North

Liberal

Roger Coles	Liberal Leader Tatchun
James McLachlan	Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

Clerk of the Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Hansard Administrator	Dave Robertson

⁰¹ Whitehorse, Yukon

Monday, May 27, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: At this time we will turn to the Order Paper.
Are there any Introduction of Visitors?

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Phillips: I would like the Members of the Legislature to welcome to the House a Yukoner who was born here and has been working outside for some time, and a very close friend of our family: my brother, Greg.

Applause

Speaker: Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I have for tabling a list of land transfers, both received and applied for, since May, 1985, and copies of correspondence.

Speaker: Are there any further Documents for Tabling?
Are there any Reports of Committees?
Are there any Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?
Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Are there any Statements by Ministers?
This then brings us to the Question Period. Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

⁰² **Question re: Devolution**

Mr. Phelps: With respect to the issue of devolution of jurisdiction programs from the federal government to our government, I understand, from previous answers given, that the Government Leader is going to be meeting with the Minister of Northern Affairs in the near future to finalize the plan for devolution, including priorities and timetables. Is that plan ready?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Cabinet of this government has developed a negotiating position with respect to a three-year timetable for devolution of federal programs to this territory. It is on the basis of that Cabinet position that I will be attempting to reach an agreement with Mr. Crombie.

Mr. Phelps: Can the Government Leader explain how the priorities were arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I cannot recall all the conversations that went into them. I do not want to get into too much detail, because it will be subject to negotiation. I would describe our position as being a practical one, a mix of what we thought was practical and possible within those timeframes and what was achievable according to a three-year timetable. We cannot do everything at once. We could not do everything in one year, practically. The timetable we are hoping to negotiate is a judicious mix of major programs and minor programs for each of the three years contemplated in the agreement.

Mr. Phelps: Is the Government Leader prepared to table the agreed-upon timetable and priority list in the House, once agreement has been reached? Is he prepared to make it public as soon as it is reached?

⁰³ **Hon. Mr. Penikett:** The one thing on which Mr. Crombie and I have already agreed is that once we have reached a mutually

satisfactory timetable, it will become a public document.

Question re: Devolution

Mr. Phelps: Has the tentative negotiating proposal of this government been discussed with officials from CYI?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No. We contemplate discussing particular programs with CYI, which the Indian people may have an interest in, as they come up. I think I would want to reach agreement with Mr. Crombie on the timetable itself before I involve CYI in those discussions.

Mr. Phelps: It would appear from questions and answers in the House last week and from immediate coverage that the Attorney General portion of justice is ready to be turned over.

Why does the government feel that that has a priority ahead of something as important as Fisheries or the transfer of Forestry responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not concede at all that it has any such priority. I would emphasize that I will feel more comfortable discussing the relative priorities once we have agreement on the timetable with the federal Minister.

Mr. Phelps: How can the government proceed into these negotiations with the federal Minister without first consulting people in the Yukon to find out what their aspirations are with regard to their priorities? Obviously we are missing something if Fisheries is behind the Attorney General transfer.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am amazed by both the preamble and the question. The Leader of the Official Opposition, the former Land Claims negotiator, asked how we can proceed with negotiations without any consultation with people of the Yukon. That was something that was unheard of previously.

We are talking about a timetable; we are not talking about the actual negotiations. We are talking about facilitating negotiations about the particulars, coming to an agreement about a common timetable. We will endeavour to transfer the following programs this year, the following programs next year and another group of programs the following year.

Within the schedule for each year, there is no particular priority other than that we have identified some major and some minor programs. The major programs are very costly and very complicated. We will not be trying to bite off more than we can chew in any given year in that regard.

With respect to small programs or ones that do not involve a lot of person-years and a lot of money, we are contemplating transferring a number of those in every year under the agreement.

⁰⁴

Question re: Free trade negotiations

Mr. McLachlan: My question is for the Government Leader. Will the Government Leader request or, perhaps, the better wording might be, demand of the Prime Minister a seat for the Yukon Territory at the negotiating table on free trade talks, which, hopefully, will begin in Ottawa some time in June?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The status of even big provinces like Ontario and Quebec at the negotiations is not yet clear. As I understand it, from the conference I attended last year, there was a commitment that the provinces would be consulted or would have a voice. Exactly how the provinces are to have a voice is still to be determined. There is a meeting in Ottawa on Monday. It is not yet clear whether we are to be invited, which is, at this point, I gather, a First Minister's dinner, it appears to be, on the subject of the free trade negotiations.

As the Member will know, we have participated at the officials level, and I am try to ascertain at this moment whether we will be provided any standing at the First Minister's meeting on Monday.

Mr. McLachlan: Can the Government Leader then advise the Legislative Assembly what procedures, or what pressures, or what tact he is using to try to get representation for the Yukon Territory at these talks?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not know about the tactics. If there is a dinner at 24 Sussex Drive, presumably the occupant is the person who is entitled to decide who he will or will not invite. As the Member knows, neither at First Minister's Conferences nor even at

Premier's Conferences have we had a vote, if you like. We have only had a voice. We have only been invited to the table to make a formal presentation. At those conferences, our officials have had a similar standing with other officials.

In the trade talks, there has been a development in that our officials have a similar standing to provincial officials in the preparations for the Canada-U.S. trade talks. If we are to receive similar standing as our officials, then, of course, we will be invited to the meeting on Monday. I hope that I will know before this day is out, or within the next day or two, exactly whether or not we will be at the table.

Mr. McLachlan: In the event that we are able to attend the conference, is it the intention of the Government Leader to let the people of the Yukon know, in advance, the position that he will be presenting at that table, or will we have to watch national television to determine the position?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I doubt very much if the dinner on Monday will be a televised event. I doubt very much if any substantial negotiations on this question will be televised.

There is, as well, in the second or third week in June, a Trade Ministers meeting, to which we have been invited. That may be more important when it comes to fleshing out our particular positions.

At this point, the only province that has filed a formal position before the official group with respect to their policy on these negotiations is Ontario. No other province has done so yet.

At this point, they are still talking about the process, how the provinces will be consulted and how they will have a voice.

Question re: Crestview gravel pit

Mr. Nordling: With respect to the Crestview gravel pit, on May 21, the Minister of Community and Transportation Services said that his department's engineers were assessing the need for acceleration/deceleration lanes for the truck terminal facility, and the need would, hopefully, be determined in the next few days. Has this determination been made?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Not officially. There is mounting information suggesting that deceleration and acceleration lanes are not required. The requirement would rather be to change the access to the pit itself.

Mr. Nordling: The Minister also said that the Government of the Yukon would be making the decisions with respect to highway safety. Has the Minister, or the engineers in his department, at any time offered an opinion to the City of Whitehorse as to the safety aspects of using the Crestview gravel pit for the truck terminal?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The issue of highway safety is our purview. In order to ensure highway safety, there was initially a suggestion that deceleration/acceleration lanes would be required if the existing access to that gravel pit were to be maintained.

We have expressed our clear position on the matter, and both Yukon-Alaska Transport and the City of Whitehorse know where we stand.

Mr. Nordling: I take it from the Minister's answer that the only concern was with respect to site lines and the acceleration/deceleration lanes. Will the report in which the decision as to whether there will be acceleration/deceleration lanes, and the decisions with respect to the safety of that location, be made public?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: For the Member's information, there is not an official engineering study of the site. It has not been contemplated. We were using the professional judgement of engineers on staff. On the basis of their recommendations, we are currently deciding the safest method of using that site.

That is where it stands. I do not anticipate having an engineering report worked up on the subject. I believe that the information from the engineers can be communicated verbally to the government.

Question re: Emission control standards

Mr. Phillips: I have a question for the Government Leader regarding the action on emission control standards for all new installations of wood burning appliances. Has the government established those standards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do not believe so, yet, by regulation.

Mr. Phillips: There also seems to be a bureaucratic hold-up — and the hold-up, I believe, is with the Yukon territorial government — at setting the standards. We passed a motion in this House on April 9. When will the government be establishing it?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Phillips: Has the Government Leader, or any of his officials, met with the City of Whitehorse and either informed them of when they expect the standards to be set and when they will be coming down with these new standards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe there have been a number of meetings at all levels with the City officials on this question, but as to the particulars I will have to report back to the Member.

Question re: Faro trailers

Mrs. Firth: I have a follow-up question for the Government Leader regarding the Faro trailers. On April 1, 1986, the Government Leader gave a commitment to the House that he would bring back some information as to the disposal of those trailers. I asked a question last week and was told that it would be more properly submitted in a written form. I would like to know if the Government Leader is going to give an answer with regard to the Faro trailers and when they are going to be sold?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, we are going to give an answer, but I cannot give an answer yet to the Member because a firm date has not been set yet for the sale of those assets, or the exact method of sale, or whether it will be done as one lot or as several lots.

Mrs. Firth: My first supplementary is more in the form of an expression of a question as to why it is taking so long. I mean, we were given a commitment on the first of April. That is some two months ago. When are the trailers going to be sold, and what seems to be the problem causing the hold-up with the tendering of the sale?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I should explain that it is not exclusively my decision. There is a recommendation that has to come from the Board of Survey to Management Board in order to expedite this matter, and it is in process now.

Question re: Casino Trail

Mr. Coles: Two weeks ago the Minister of Community and Transportation Services said that the government was going to be spending approximately \$700,000 to begin the development of the Casino Trail, and he also said that it would include very little Cat work or machinery work. Is this all for surveying and planning?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The figure I gave the Member was, I believe, what was considered to be appropriate for engineering work and there was a suggestion that prior to September of this year, very little in the way of Cat work, development work, could be undertaken. A committee, struck between the Management Committee of the Roads to Resources Program and the Chamber of Mines, is currently identifying the site line for the road corridor, and a lot of engineering work has to be done. If development work can be done, probably at the end of the summer, probably into the early fall, then certainly it will be.

Mr. Coles: Is the engineering survey work going to be contracted out or will the government department be doing most of it itself?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am not sure of the details. I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Coles: Does the Minister know yet whether or not Treasury Board in Ottawa has approved any money at all for this road?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: My understand is it has not, but I will check to make certain.

Question re: Land claims

Mr. Phelps: On April 30, I asked a question to the Government Leader about certain newspaper articles that had to do with words and letters between CYI and Government of Yukon wherein the CYI indicated its displeasure of having the Yukon government priorities brought to the land claims table even though they were only indirectly related to land claims.

In the follow-up question that day, I asked whether or not the

Government Leader had received letters from CYI asking that this practice desist. Has the Government Leader checked into this? Is there such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I can find no letter on that subject. I did previously inform the Leader of the Official Opposition, when he first asked the question, that it was quite an old concern and one that had been satisfactorily resolved by the time he asked the question.

I believe I informed him that CYI had originally requested that any initiative that this government was taking in which they might deem to have a vital interest ought to be brought to the table so that they could be advised.

It subsequently turned out that the number of initiatives being taken by this government was of such a great benefit to the Indian people that they found that rather than expediting the land claim work, it was impeding it. I subsequently received a representation from the Chairman of the CYI that the government and the Executive of the CYI should deal on a bilateral basis on those matters that are not directly related to land claims, but which were of interest to Yukon Indian people. That is the procedure that we have been following since that representation was made to me.

Mr. Phelps: Was that representation made in the form of a letter from the Chairman of CYI?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: My most vivid memory of the subject is that may have been made originally in a letter, but the really substantial discussion took place in a meeting in my office between Mr. Smith and me.

Mr. Phelps: The reason I am raising this question is that back on April 30 the Government Leader said that if there was a letter, which he did not recall, he would have no problem tabling it in the House, providing he had the consent of CYI. Would the Government Leader check to see if there was such a letter and table it in the House?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will double-check; I will have someone on my staff double-check to see if there was a letter. If there was any such letter and if CYI agrees, I will table it in the House.

Question re: Faro housing mortgage

Mr. Nordling: With respect to Faro housing, on April 16, in debate on a motion to amend the second mortgage to include all protection clauses contained in normal mortgages, the Minister of Government Services said, "We have negotiated all the appropriate legalese and fine print and technicalities and that will be forthcoming when all these things are registered and made public."

Have these amendments been registered at this time?

Hon. Mr. Kimmerly: I have no specific personal knowledge about that. I will check and get back to the Member.

Question re: Wild game study

Mr. Coles: In the Throne Speech last March, the Government Leader said that the government had commissioned a study on the farming of wild game species, and would soon be receiving the recommendations from that study. Has the Minister of Renewable Resources got recommendations from the study now?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, I have not received any conclusions on the study. I can check into the specific question. I will find out what stage the study is at and report back to the Member.

Mr. Coles: Is the study being done by the Minister's department, or a private organization?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am not personally familiar with the details of the question. I will undertake to find out what stage the study is at, and I will give that information to the Member.

Mr. Coles: Could the Minister also find and report back to the House exactly which species are being studied for farming?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes. I can tell the Member, offhand, that what we are looking at is the species known as elk and also reindeer.

Question re: Porter Creek C paving

Mr. Lang: With respect to the question of deficiencies, or workmanship, as far as the pavement that was just put down last fall in the Porter Creek C area, how much work in the area is going to

have to be done to bring it up to an acceptable standard?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There was a minor deficiency list, which was discussed with Skookum Construction a couple of weeks ago. That deficiency list included the resurfacing of approximately 300-and-some metres of pavement.

Apart from that, the list was of minor nature only, and the work should be completed early in June. It is clear from the nature of the work that there will be no cost to the government or the taxpayers resulting from the work to be done.

Question re: COPE Land Claim Agreement

Mr. Phelps: I have a follow-up question of the Minister of Renewable Resources regarding some questions I asked on April 30 pertaining to the proposed national park in the northwest corner of Yukon. The question had to do with the concern that the people of Old Crow were not going to be accorded an equal footing pertaining to job opportunities in the park equal to the Inuvialuit. At that time, the Minister of Renewable Resources said that he would look into the situation and carefully examine the COPE agreement and the rights of the people of Old Crow, vis-a-vis the people of the COPE Land Claim Agreement. What has he done in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The COPE or Inuvialuit agreement very specifically talks about the creation of a park in the northern Yukon. Their rights are clearly articulated in that agreement. The rights of the people of Old Crow do not have the same kind of merit in law, if you will, in that agreement. Clearly, the Inuvialuit's rights to the development of that park are set in place, and it can be broadly defined as preferential to any other right. That is the fact of law that exists.

I do not know if the Member's questions relate to that particular park, or if they relate to a proposed park that would go into the Old Crow Flats region. That is something else that is different from the existing park.

The discussions surrounding the implementation of the COPE final agreement have dragged on for years. I have signed, a couple of weeks ago, an agreement with the Minister of DIAND to make the necessary funds available for implementation. I expect that there will be a whole series of discussions now on the implementation on the COPE agreement that we will actively be partaking in.

Mr. Phelps: The issue is this: that the federal government agree with the people of Old Crow that should the park be extended in a southern direction on to the flats, that they would have preferential treatment in a similar manner to those rights given to the Inuvialuit, and secondly, that Old Crow would be the main gateway to the park.

Has the Minister taken steps to ascertain whether or not the people of Old Crow wanted to go ahead with the extension of the park south of the watershed line as previously agreed so that the people of Old Crow can stand on an equal footing?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Department of Renewable Resources did meet with the people of Old Crow with respect to the whole issue of the implementation of the COPE agreement and issues such as the park. I should report that there is some hesitancy as to the establishment of further areas for park purposes. As we are aware, the people of Old Crow are represented in the negotiations in the Yukon with respect to settlement issues, and they are looking at trying to use a settlement vehicle in the Yukon to entrench their rights, and very specifically give them fee simple rights and subsurface rights to certain lands that are now posed as possible lands for inclusion into a possible park in the future.

However, should there be a decision by the people of Old Crow to take the steps of extending the park, it would be my position — and I would do whatever possible to influence the overall government position — that any extension of the park, with respect to lands in the Old Crow area south of what are the current park boundaries, would be that the people of Old Crow should realize a preferential benefit.

Mr. Phelps: The rights of the people of Old Crow were fully taken into consideration in the previous negotiations. They were to retain, not only the preferential treatment, but their trapping rights, rights to acquire some lands, and so on.

Has anybody explained to those people what they stand to lose if

this matter is left in abeyance? They could be the big losers in terms of the Inuvialuit getting the complete edge with respect to all the economic opportunities associated with this new park.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In my discussions with the Member for Old Crow, it is clear that the Member for Old Crow has represented the interests of the people and has attempted to assist the department in setting up meetings and informing the people of Old Crow as to, generally, the issues of the North Slope.

The big problem with the whole implementation of the COPE agreement is that it has been dragged on for a couple of years. The major hangup has been the lack of turn-around, if you will, with respect to decisions on the finances that are needed to implement the COPE agreement.

That is behind us now, as far as I am concerned. We have signed an agreement with the federal government that stipulates the dollars that will be utilized to implement the agreement. We have the authority to spend. We have named the various people to the various boards that are required as a result of that agreement. I assure the Member that the people of Old Crow are more than adequately represented on those boards. I suspect that, in the future, there will be a great deal of discussion between this government — specifically me — the Member for Old Crow and the people of Old Crow, with respect to the rights of Old Crow residents, vis-a-vis the COPE agreement.

Question re: Statistics useful to business

Mrs. Firth: I have had several inquiries from constituents of mine who are business people requesting what kind of information is available to them to assist in the operations of their business. I asked the Government Leader a question on April 30, in the Economic Development debate, about such a list of statistics and information being made available.

Can the Government Leader tell me when he is going to make the list available for me for my constituents?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I apologize to the Member for Riverdale South. She will have to be more specific about the information that she is looking for, for me to be able to answer in Question Period. I do know that I have directed my staff, for all the outstanding questions — and there have been hundreds of them in this session — to gather the information and make it available as the questions came up in the House. Some of it we are able to obtain quite quickly; other answers take a little longer.

If the Member did give me notice of her question, or put a question on record during that debate, the answer will be coming to her.

Mrs. Firth: It was in the Bureau of Statistics debate, and it was specifically statistical information that was available for businesses that could help them in various areas, such as marketing and so on.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As a general rule, one of the services provided by the Statistics Bureau is to give demographic and marketing information about the Yukon territory.

If I recall, the Member did ask questions concerning some information that is now provided on a selective basis to businesses after they make inquiries, and whether or not some of that could be published as a matter of routine. There may be some policy or expenditure matter that I would have to direct myself to. I have not made any decision yet if there is any expenditure involved.

Response re: Wolves

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have have some answers to questions that have been asked by the Member for Kluane. He asked for a breakdown of the wolves in the Finlayson area and in game zones 7 and 9.

The numbers for 1983 are: Finalyson, 105; game zones 7 and 9, 77. In 1984: Finlayson, 106; 7 and 9, 55. In 1985: Finalyson, 49; 7 and 9, 95.

In 1986, the most recent figures that we have received to date, the total is 58. These numbers represent not only the government's efforts in those geographic areas, but also the efforts of the trappers in the regions.

The Member asked a question that was also asked by myself of the previous Minister about the cost per wolf of the program. These

are very interesting numbers. In 1983, the cost to government to take wolves under the program was \$160. In 1986, those costs have inflated to \$500 per wolf.

The explanation that I have been given by the department for the escalation of costs is that they are associated with the fact that when the program was initiated the wolves were highly congregated and there was a great number of them in packs. Now the department, because of the thinning out of the wolf population, is having to range farther and farther in the field to be able to track wolves.

On another question about the number of wolves taken by trappers in zones 7 and 9, the numbers are not known for this trapping season because we have not received those returns. However, in previous years the number were 15 and 20.

The wolf survey in the Nisling Valley revealed that there are 3.5 wolves per thousand square miles, and these numbers are interesting as well. In other areas that have been studied, the wolf population is much denser; we are looking at 10 wolves per thousand square miles.

A report on the census and the results of the study will be tabled in the fall as a part of the annual report of the wolf research and management studies.

The Member also asked questions about the Kluane area. I believe it was Mr. Theberge who did some work there. A PhD student from the University of Waterloo, by the name of Dave Gautier, studied a couple of packs of wolves in relation to the Burwash caribou studies near Kluane Lake. Three wolves were collared. We have not received any signals from those collars, so we assume that those wolves that were collared and studied are dead or have moved out of that area.

Since 1985, 15 wolves have been radio-instrumented; three were captured on the ground and the rest were captured by helicopter.

In response to whether the person involved was qualified to do the work, my information is that the student from MIT did spend a year with the Department of Renewable Resources and is considered qualified to do the work with respect to the snaring of wolves.

12

Question re: Curragh Resources ore markets

Mr. McLachlan: When the Government Leader returned from his trip to the Far East in November of last year with Mr. Frame, he was able to report that concentrate sales for "the year" had been secured and finalized. In this case, the expression "the year" sales and "a year" sales tend to get intertwined and rolled up too closely.

The message seemed to be clear that the concentrate sales for the period June to December were firm. Has the Government Leader been able to learn anything further from Mr. Frame and Curragh if, in fact, markets have been secured for concentrate production beginning January, 1987 onwards into that year?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: On the basis of one trip to the Far East and visits with the smelter companies, I would claim no expertise, but it is my understanding that the mating season, as Mr. Frame calls it, happens every fall for the coming year.

The commitments made for the production in 1986 are firm. A recent communication from Mr. Frame indicated to me that they had exceeded their expectations in the Korean market. That is significant, because Korea Zinc is the only smelter company in that part of the world that is expanding its capacity at this point. It may have something to do with the health of the Korean auto industry, I do not know. They were increasing their capacity. I believe the mine at Faro has made a significant placement of ore with that smelter.

Mr. McLachlan: Do I interpret from that answer that that means an increasing demand in Korea has now secured a full 12 months of production from the Faro mine, regardless of what particular year that may occur in?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The Member may well know more about this than I do, but I understand that that is not the way it works, that it is the 1986 production that has been sold to the smelters, and there has been some preliminary discussions about 1987 production. 1987 will be the first full year of ore available.

As it is in the nature of these things, with the mine coming back

into the market like this, those old customers of Faro were disappointed when the mine shut down, and had to find other sources of ore. For the most part, they found it in Australia.

It is production from Australian mines that will have to be, in part, displaced by Faro coming back onto the market. There is an adjustment period that takes some time. I think that is why so much of the ore was going to the European market in 1986.

I believe that, having placed the 1986 production satisfactorily, the ability to sell the 1987 product will be much easier.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chairman: I will now call Committee of the Whole to order. We will now recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: The Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

We are on Public Service Commission, Recruitment and Training, general debate.

Bill No. 5 — Second Appropriation Act, 1986-87 — continued

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I believe I had just answered a question about \$68,000 on page 205.

On Recruitment Operations

Recruitment Operations in the amount of \$325,000 agreed to On Recruitment

Mr. McLachlan: The Government Leader has in part answered by saying that there have been times when it seemed that the government was unable to pay enough money to attract qualified people. He has answered one question that was on my mind, but there seemed to be times when the candidates came either from Faro, Whitehorse, or Vancouver and Edmonton, New Zealand or the jungles of Papua, New Guinea, to take an inordinately long time to fill some positions, some of them remaining open as long as four and five months.

The net result is that we have some money left over and we can vote it back. That sometimes seems like a plus, but, surely, that is not the name of the game. The name of the game is to recruit the individual, pay the money that is owing him and to get him in there to do the work.

Has the Government Leader any thoughts on why it sometimes takes as long as it does to fill some of the positions that we have in the PSC?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Unfortunately, it takes a minimum of two months. In the rare cases when we have to hire from outside it will take longer than that.

It takes two weeks to get an ad into the newspapers. There is a period of quite a few days before there are replies. The short listing of the people who apply and the interviews, the offer, the waiting for a reply to the offer, the person accepting and agreeing to start and in some cases relocating, does take time. It is a regrettable fact of life.

It takes no more time though than in the private sector. I used to think it took a lot longer, but when I talk to people who run large companies, especially when they are hiring senior people, it takes

them quite a long time, especially to get an agreement from a valuable person to leave the job he is in. He has to give notice there too.

If you are talking about someone to be an equipment operator in a small community, it does not take very long because there are people available. If you are talking about a highly skilled occupation, a professional in particular, it does take a long time.

Mr. McLachlan: Do we accept, as a normal practice, that when an employee leaves, the position will then be vacant for a period of time and unfilled. Secondly, is it the Government Leader's general experience that the more senior the position, the longer the time it is going to take to fill it?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The answer to the second question is yes. The first one is that it does take some time to fill the vacancies, but we do have people acting, in many departments, in a position for a while. It is not as if the work goes undone.

Mr. Nordling: I notice that, under the line Recruitment, from 1984-85 the amount has gone up from almost \$500,000 to the 1986-87 Estimate of nearly \$700,000. Is the department doing anything different that would explain the \$200,000 a year increase?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: A more useful figure is to compare the 1985-86 Forecast to the 1986-87. As a result of the reorganization that occurred between the period of 1984 and 1985 and the period now, I am not sure that the figures are exactly comparable. The major change in this budget is not that we are going to be spending less money on recruitment, but we are going to be spending more money on training. Therefore, the relative weight between recruitment and training will change in this budget. That is the most significant shift there.

Mr. Nordling: I am looking at the total figures. The 1984-85 Actual was just over \$900,000, and we are looking at \$1.4 million now. Could the Government Leader explain what reorganization took place or what was added to this particular area to cause a \$500,000 increase in the space of two years?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am equipped to explain the increase from 1985-86 to 1986-87, but I will have to come back with more detail about why there is the jump from the 1984-85.

Recruitment in the amount of \$697,000 agreed to

On Training Operations

Training Operations in the amount of \$91,000 agreed to

On Staff Training and Development

Mr. Phelps: Fifty-nine percent is a fairly significant increase. Could the Government Leader elaborate on this, given that we do have the additional program, the Positive Action Program?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The largest part of that is explained by the \$68,000 extra that we are putting into this budget for recruiting in this year. That is in this line.

Staff Training and Development in the amount of \$261,000 agreed to

On On the Job Training

On the Job Training in the amount of \$24,000 agreed to

Recruitment and Training in the amount of \$1,398,000 agreed to On Employee Records and Pensions

Mrs. Firth: I do not know if this is the appropriate area to ask this question, but can the Minister can give me any idea what the percentage of staff turnover could be from this budget and the last budget?

I notice that there are a lot of new employees within the government. Can we have some more specific numbers or percentages in what the turnover could be?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am advised that there has been a pattern of 18 to 20 percent turnover in the last couple of years. I am interested in the Member's question itself. I think it might be useful to get some precise numbers for the last few years. I will ask the Commission to develop those numbers, and I will also provide them to the Member. I will also have a look at them myself.

Mrs. Firth: I have a further question to that. I am sure that it is going to be done in a departmental sense. I think it would be interesting to see if there are certain departments that are keeping their staff for longer or where there could be the majority of the turnover. I would appreciate that information, too.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I think that could be done, allowing for the

fact that very small departments, of course, could have distortions by a couple of people leaving in one year. I think we can do that, and I will look at it.

I am advised that there was a time when, in fact, the turnover was as high as 35 percent; we have come down from that. I will see what it is now.

*Administration in the amount of \$229,000 agreed to
On Labour Relations*

Mr. Phelps: I have been receiving some complaints from some contract employees who say that they are not receiving the incremental increase for their second year of the bonus. I understand that some employees have been receiving it and some have not. Is there some reason for this?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I understand it, contract employees do get merit increases, but, perhaps, the most useful thing to do, if the Leader of the Official Opposition has some individual cases, would be for me to look at them. The only thing that I know that we are doing with the contracts is, as the Member knows, trying to get out of the business of having contracts except for very short, discreet periods of time.

Mr. Lang: I have a question for the Minister with respect to the question of the JES and the consequences thereof where the labourers effectively got a five cent increase — \$2.00 a week, \$8 a month — when people in the higher scale, in the \$40,000, \$50,000 to \$55,000 range, got a \$3,000 to \$4,000 increase depending on their responsibilities and positions. Could the Minister make a comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I do know, without knowing the particular cases referred to the Member, that there were some people who had a very small increase as a result of them having been red-circled, and they were at the top of the range already.

Mr. Lang: What I do not understand is why would we be paying the labourers who work for the government, in this particular case, \$12.76, and I think we went up a nickle because of the JES, to \$12.81, and, at the same time, in our contracts the minimum schedule for a contractor to pay somebody who is in the category of labouring is a minimum of \$13.00?

Mr. Penikett: I believe the Member is comparing the Fair Wage Schedule and the rate paid in the government here. I do not know all the historic rationale for that discrepancy, but I would be happy to take a look into it and come back with a detailed answer for the Member.

Mr. Lang: The session is coming to a close and my concern is that we have a situation where management has been in charge of getting a study done; management has done quite well. These men and women happen to be casuals, which is really not their fault because of the nature of the work. I defend the government's right there. They are rehired on an annual basis. Everybody talks about the cost of living and we expect them to make do on an increase of two dollars a week, which does not even get them into the movie.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: There are a couple of issues here. It was not management people who benefitted in the main from JES, but the people I identified the other day who were, in many cases, clerks and so forth. There is often a difference between a labourer who works a short construction season for \$13.00-some an hour and the labourer who works year round for the government. There is often a difference between what people are paid in construction and what people are paid in government.

I will be happy to take a look at the numbers the Member raised in terms of the pay situation of casuals and get back to him. I admit that we may well not be able get back to him before the session is over, but I would be happy to get back to him as soon as I can.

Mr. Lang: I am not going to belabour the situation. This side is concerned. If these people were in a year-round basis, I could understand it, and there would be rationale for your argument that these people should be red-circled because of certain conditions. You are dealing with people who are hired on a fairly regular basis. Some of them have worked for this government for quite some time for a nine month period. I understand that why you cannot put them on permanent. I understand that. I defend your right to stand up and say why.

There just does not seem to be any comparability or fairness.

These people have mortgages to pay, children to send to school just like you and I, and I think the consequences of that decision have to be reviewed.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I will have to review it. The rate negotiated for labourers in the collective agreement is negotiated at the table. It is not something that the government arbitrarily imposes, and of course the fair wage schedule is something established by the Employment Standards Board, which has an arm's length relationship with the government, so there is not necessarily any relationship between those two things.

The other thing that the Member should bear in mind with respect to the casuals is that they get six percent holiday pay working for this government where, in the private sector, they get four percent and that does make a difference to their overall income.

Mr. Lang: Depending upon where you are coming from, you can get as high as 10 percent in the private sector.

Mr. Phelps: I want to go back to my previous question. The representation that I am receiving is that there was a two year bonus in the contract — \$900 for the first year and then \$900 over the next 26 pay cheques. These people are saying that since the pay period in April this fiscal year they have not received any increases. I am wondering if that is widespread in their contracts or if they are, somehow or other, misinterpreting what they should be getting.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Rather than asking for a whole pile of cases, if the Member would give me one or two I will look at them and I will get back to him with the information.

On Operations

Mr. Phelps: Why is there a 50 percent increase?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The unusually large percentage change in the Labour Relations branch expenditures are due to the fact that Personnel funds were not fully utilized and were reallocated in other areas in 1985. The 1986-87 Estimates represent funding at full staff complement. I would remind the Members that the branch was created as a result of the reorganization in 1985. The director's position was not staffed until July, and the labour relations officer position in September.

Operations in the amount of \$111,000 agreed to

On Yukon Government Employees Union/Public Service Alliance of Canada

Yukon Government Employees Union/Public Service Alliance of Canada in the amount of \$31,000 agreed to

On Yukon Teachers Association

Yukon Teachers Association in the amount of \$16,000 agreed to

On Managerial/Confidential Exclusion

Mr. McLachlan: I do not understand why there is a particular cost item with this item of excluding managers on a confidential basis.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: This is for funding for legal expenses incurred in negotiating separation agreements between this government and managerial employees or confidentially excluded employees.

Managerial/Confidential Exclusion in the amount of \$5,000 agreed to

On Employee Assistance Program

Mr. Phelps: That has come down substantially. Is that because the program is enjoying success?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: No, it is somewhat as a result of some reorganization. The Employee Assistance Program was previously under Training. It has been moved to Labour Relations. It is, as we know from the Ministerial Statement, undergoing a review now. I cannot tell the Member what the financial consequences in the next fiscal year will be as a result of getting into more preventative health care programs, and so forth.

It is something we are having to look at because there is a new interest and commitment to this program by both the bargaining units associated with the government.

Employee Assistance Program in the amount of \$27,000 agreed to

On Long Service Awards

Long Service Awards in the amount of \$30,000 agreed to

Labour Relations in the amount of \$220,000 agreed to

On Workers' Compensation Fund

Hon. Mr. Penikett: We discussed this in the general debate and in Committee of the Whole. This is the amount we assume, in the worst case scenario, we will need to cover claims. As you will see, in 1985-86 the Actual was closer to \$110,000. If we have a similar pattern this year, the money will lapse and is not reallocatable.

On Workers' Compensation Payments

Workers' Compensation Payments in the amount of \$309,000 agreed to

Workers' Compensation Fund in the Maount of \$309,000 agreed to

*On Compensation**On Operations*

Mr. Phelps: There seems to be rather a large jump in the Personnel allotments and in the Operations from last year.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: In the Personnel allotment, there is a 23 percent increase. That is because an Accounting Clerk position was transferred from the Administration branch to the Compensation branch and is being utilized at a classification of Analyst due to operational requirements.

The salary for the Accounting Clerk position was inadequate for that of the Analyst. Additional personnel dollars were required. There is a 108 percent increase mentioned by the Leader of the Official Opposition mentioned in the Other allotment. This is a funding request for various projects and classification appeals as described below.

I could go into quite a bit of detail on these, but there are significant costs associated with the classification appeals that we did not have last year.

Mr. Phelps: To what extent are we going to be going outside for advice on these appeals and the classification system from this point in time onwards?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The two co-chairs of the Appeal Board are from Vancouver.

Mr. Phelps: Is it not possible to somehow or other get or develop that sort of expertise in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: They are both experts in classification and we apparently do not have those skills present in our community. We even have considerable difficulty recruiting people in this area for this government locally.

Mr. Phelps: Are they associated with either of the companies that were involved in either the reorganization — Touche Ross, I believe — or the JES study by Mr. Willis?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: They are associated neither with Peat Marwick nor with Willis.

Operations in the amount of \$369,000 agreed to

On Classification Appeals

lassification Appeals in the amount of \$100,000 agreed to

On Projects

Projects in the amount of \$ 76,000 agreed to

Compensation in the amount of \$545,000 agreed to

On Positive Employment Program

Mr. McLachlan: During the period, the Government Leader referred to up to a two-year training program under the Positive Employment Program. Will the rate of pay for those six or so candidates who have been taken in under the PEP be increased during the course of the employment program if they continue right through to the two year program?

Do they finish at the same rate at which they started? Is there an escalating provision in here for increasing their wages?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: As I understand, they are hired into a pay range and then they will have merit steps the same as everyone else. When we talk about the two years, we are talking about a maximum. It is quite possible that someone comes in, gets a training assignment in a department, and then successfully bids on the job after a few months or even after a year. I think the two years is the maximum for a training period there.

Mr. McLachlan: I asked about the program because when one is familiar with an apprenticeship program in industry, you are nowhere near the final scale until you have reached or achieved a certain level of performance within the job. I did not get the

impression that this was the direction of the government, that they were going to start, and they were going to finish at roughly close to the same, that they were not looking for a level of achievement that merited a pay raise.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: The situation is not strictly comparable, because when the trainees come in we do not know what position they eventually may find themselves in at the point they enter. We will, after they have been taken in, attempt to match the trainees with the training positions in the departments. A person may be trained in renewable resources in a number of general areas, and they may bid, presumably, on any number of jobs from that training position. We do not know what range that job will be in that they bid on, except we do know that the training pay will be considerably below the likely position that they will be able to apply for.

Mrs. Firth: Reading the first objective of this Positive Employment Program, the last few lines talk about encouraging and facilitating recruitment of aboriginal people, handicapped people, and women. What does the objective mean, or what does the government mean when they are talking about "under-represented"?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: For example, at this point, there are no aboriginal people as deputy ministers. One woman is a deputy minister. There are, that I know of, no handicapped deputy ministers. Up until recently, there was no person in the management of the Department of Finance who was woman, but there is now. There are a lot of occupations where there have been, for example, no women or no native people, and this is an attempt to target, over time, in those areas.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to know what the government's goals are? Is it the government's intention to have one of these categories in every position where they are considered to be under-represented? I would like to know what the final outcome is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I never felt, and this is a personal view, comfortable with the idea of hard quotas because it seemed to be that they could often be artificial especially in a relatively small organization like this.

Our policy goal is to make the Public Service of the Yukon Territory more representative of the population of the Yukon Territory. We are, to state the obvious, a long way from 50 percent of our management being women. We are a long way from having 25 percent of our public servants being native people. There are very few handicapped people in the employ of this government right now. That is an area where we have a lot of policy work to do, because I do not think that we have a very good handle on what the opportunities and prospects for handicapped people are in this government, or how many there are who might be employable in the local community. That is an area where we expect the director or manager of this program to do some work in the coming year.

Mrs. Firth: When the Government Leader talks about being more representative of the population, and he talks about the particular examples he raised a few minutes ago, does the government have a plan, say, to have 50 percent of the deputy ministers to be women? I am not talking about quotas either, because that kind of smoke and mirrors clouds the whole argument. I am trying to get some idea as to exactly what the government's expectations and goals are to be as a result of that objective.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Let me try and explain it this way. At this point, about 50 percent of the people in the public service are women, but only about 20 percent of the people in management ranks are women. Using that base, as a result of these programs and the training initiatives we will take, I would like to see that percentage improve each year that we are around.

Of course, I would like to see a situation where 50 percent of the deputy ministers, for example, are women. I do not expect that I shall see it in my time in government, but I would like to move in that direction. If we start from the situation now and say that we want to improve the numbers towards the point where the public service is representative of the population as a whole, as long as we make progress in that direction, then I will be satisfied.

It may be that some particular certain groups in the community

may think we are making too rapid progress, or insufficient progress. That will be the subject for political debate, I expect, in each budget year as we proceed. Even though it is not possible at this point, I would like to be able to include that kind of statistical information in the Estimates, as this program evolves and develops.

Positive Employment Program in the amount of \$232,000 agreed to

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I could say that it is an interesting footnote that women are represented in the management group of this government to about 24 percent. Interesting enough, in the federal government it is only 12 percent, at this point.

Public Service Commission in the amount of \$3,115,000 agreed to

On the Department of Renewable Resources

Chairman: General debate?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Before I begin the debate on Renewable Resources, I have for tabling some information on the department.

As well, I have a very lengthy speech. The purpose of doing a lengthy speech is the call from the opposition for more detail and more information. I checked with the Speaker's office, specifically with the Clerk's office, to see if I could deem the speech to have been read into the record, but he informs me that the rules of this Legislature do not permit that so Members are going to have to simply bear with me until I have concluded the speech.

I would have sent a copy to the critic earlier, but I just got the final draft of the speech today. I will make available a copy to the Member to review as we read through it. I will begin the presentation of the budget.

²² It is with considerable pleasure that I introduce and speak to the O&M Budget for the Department of Renewable Resources for the 1986-87 fiscal year.

In brief overview, the Department of Renewable Resources has continued to adapt and restructure itself to accommodate its increasing management responsibilities. It is doing so in a way that it is increasingly responsive to community needs and community interests. It is doing so in a way that is in keeping with the Yukon government's overall goals for renewable resource use and renewable resource enhancement of the territory.

These goals are: economic diversification, open and accessible government, and quality of life and environment.

In broad perspective, the Yukon government is committed to renewable resource development as a contribution to economic diversification and economic stability in the territory.

The government is also determined to ensure that open and responsive consultation takes place in the management of its natural resources.

Within the framework of regional and economic development, the government has firmly resolved to conserve the Yukon's renewable resources, to maintain a high standard of environmental quality and to support viable resource-based lifestyle opportunities for Yukon residents.

These are cornerstone positions that the government has advocated since its election in May of 1985. These positions have shaped and directed the significant advances that we have made in renewable resource management in the past 12 months, and they will continue to provide the foundation for the new initiatives that the department will be undertaking in the coming months.

There is an additional theme that we must also recognize in designing our resource management activities. We must address the national and international responsibilities that we assume by being part of the larger Canadian democracy. We should not think of ourselves solely as Yukoners. We are blessed with an amazing array of natural resources in the territory, which, if properly managed, will provide us with a high standard of living and a sustainable future.

However, our environment and resources are a part of a complex world ecosystem that does not function in isolated bits. In the past three weeks, we have witnessed a frightening and graphic example of how interconnected we are. A nuclear accident a long way away in the Soviet Union has caused radioactive fallout throughout the Northern Hemisphere.

There are many other ways in which events, both positive and

negative, outside of the Yukon can affect our resources and livelihood. We must remember to look outward as well as to local needs when we design our new programs and policies.

Today, I would like to speak to a number of our new initiatives in some detail and provide the highlights of these programs for the Members opposite. In doing so, I believe, we will answer many of the questions previously raised during the early debates and thereby avoid the need for any repetition. I trust this will be an acceptable approach making the best use of the time available to the House.

Much of what I have to say elaborates on projects that are implemented using salary dollars as well as through line budget items. This underlines the broad-reaching taskload undertaken by the Renewable Resources staff.

As you are aware, the department contains five branches: Administration; Policy and Planning; Lands, Parks and Resources; Fish and Wildlife and the new Agricultural branch.

Within these five branches, the department has a staff establishment of 76 permanent person-years broken down as follows: Administration, 13; Policy and Planning, 8.5; Lands, Parks, and Resources, 15; Fish and Wildlife, 36.5; Agriculture, 3; for a total of 76.

²³ This reflects a price and increase of four new person-years over last year. Three of these new person-years will be dedicated to agriculture as follows: Director, 1 person-year; Agricultural Development Officer, 1 person-year; and the remaining person-year will be divided on a half-time basis between a half-time inspector agronomist and a half-time secretary. The fourth new position is that of a harvest biologist to work with the Fish and Wildlife Branch.

The total, for 1986-87 budget request, represents a modest seven percent increase over the 1985-86 budget to be distributed as follows: Administration, \$775,000; Policy and Planning, \$584,000; Lands, Parks and Resources, \$1,128,000; Fish and Wildlife, \$3,115,000; Agriculture, \$217,000; for a total of \$5,819,000.

I will now proceed to detail some of the work highlights for each of these branches: Fish and Wildlife; Lands, Parks and Resources; Agriculture; Policy Planning; and, Administration.

In the Fish and Wildlife Branch, the fish and wildlife resources of the Yukon represent one of the major underpinnings to the Yukon economy, and these resources have always been available during periods when our other economic sectors have undergone volatile fluctuations. This sustainable use is increasingly at the centre of the management philosophy of the Fish and Wildlife Branch, and I would like to remind you all of some of the major and continuing achievements in this area. Additionally, I would like to introduce a few of the significant changes that have been initiated during the last year.

Following representations by local organizations in Old Crow and Teslin, we will be relocating a Conservative Officer position from Whitehorse to Teslin and will be creating a new Conservative Officer position in Old Crow from a former headquarters position. This position was the former Special Services Officer. These moves will provide more effective and efficient service to rural Yukon and improve our management of the wildlife resources.

As part of the new overall strategic plan, which will guide the future of the department, the *Wildlife Act* will have to be redrafted. I will say more about the strategic plan later, but it is my understanding that a review of the *Wildlife Act* is well underway and will provide for an updated and more responsive act. We all recognize the essential importance of our various wildlife species for both consumptive and non-consumptive uses. Efficient and fair regulation of these uses, with conservation as a primary criterion, should not be a debatable point.

On the trapping and fur promotion campaign, we all recognize that the harvest of furbearing small mammals is a very important part of the economic and social fabric of the Yukon. About 750 Yukoners trapped 14 different species of furbearers on 380 registered traplines and in five group areas. Over the past three years, the value of the furs harvested in the Yukon has averaged about \$1 million to \$1.5 million annually. This important industry is now threatened by a growing anti-trapping lobby based in Europe, Southern Canada and the United States. This lobby

threatens the destruction of the social and cultural lifestyles of aboriginal and non-aboriginal people in the Yukon as well as across the rest of Canada, and has received a great deal of attention in the media.

Our government is helping the trapping industry to counteract the anti-trapping lobby. As the Minister of Renewable Resources, I have committed the Department of Renewable Resources to the following actions: mounting an extensive counter-attack, combining forces with other Canadian jurisdictions; designing our own program showing the Yukon conditions; funding industry groups mounting counter-campaigns; and, playing a central role as a government in the pro-trapping campaign.

As you are aware, the department's pro-trapping strategy is designed to have three main focusses: international, national and local.

The international strategy involves providing funding for international groups that are supportive of trapping to carry out an informational campaign in Europe.

This strategy is now well underway, and the department's funding of the campaign demonstrates that our government recognizes the importance of the trapping and fur industry in the Yukon and is committed to ensuring its continued viability as a way of life to northern Canadians.

The government has, in total, allocated \$173,000 to groups, including the Yukon Trappers Association, the Council for Yukon Indians, Fur Institute of Canada, ISI, the Yukon Conservation Society and the Yukon Fish and Game Association, to support their pro-trapping promotions.

We will be reviewing the effectiveness of these expenditures before making future allocations. I would like to add at this time, however, that the Fish and Game Association bumper sticker is an excellent idea, and I understand that they are being snapped up and are showing up in the streets of Vancouver.

The pro-fur promotion has already had some successes, as groups such as Greenpeace Canada have begun to rethink their positions on trapping. We anticipate that our campaign will have similar effects in Europe and other parts of the world. Many of the groups that provide mild support for the anti-trapping lobby are composed of quite reasonable people who, I believe, will be swayed by the weight of our argument.

On the Porcupine Caribou Agreement, negotiations for an agreement with respect to the Porcupine caribou was, as the Member opposite will recall, a lengthy and time-consuming ten-year exercise. We were delighted last October 26 to sign in Old Crow, on behalf of our government, an in-Canada Porcupine Management Agreement.

This cooperative agreement, developed by the governments and traditional users in this important renewable resource, ensures the continued protection and well-being of the Porcupine caribou herd and its habitat in Canada. It establishes a management board, including representation from the three governments and the native communities involved. These communities are Old Crow, Dawson, Mayo, Aklavik, Fort McPherson, Arctic Red River, Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk.

The board will be formally established and will hold its first meeting this summer. It will make recommendations to the governments on all matters relating to the management of the herd in Canada, such as the annual quantities of caribou to be harvested, land use issues and resource studies.

The main objectives of that agreement are: to cooperatively manage the Porcupine caribou herd and its habitat to ensure its conservation; to recognize a special relationship exists between native users and the caribou; to recognize and protect certain priorities and priority harvesting rights for the native user groups; to acknowledge that others may also share in harvesting and to provide for native participation in Porcupine caribou herd management.

As the Porcupine caribou herd migrates across territorial and international boundaries — from northeast Alaska across the Yukon and into the northern part of the Northwest Territories — this agreement is particularly important because it provides a basis for negotiation with the US on an international Porcupine caribou agreement. Of particular concern are the critical calving areas,

primarily in Alaska, that may receive pressure from oil and gas developments.

In December, 1985, Canadian and United States delegations — agency officials and user groups — met informally to determine the status of management activities within each country.

Although the US authorities have not proceeded nearly as far as Canada in attaining a stated national mandate, they did wish to informally pursue several principles.

In advance of formal international negotiations they recommended that a smaller working group should meet to clarify and elaborate on principles which could lay a framework for an agreement. The Yukon has provided leadership to a subgroup consisting of three United States and three Canadian representatives who met in Anchorage in February and April, 1986, to flesh out the principles and produce a working document to focus the discussions of the full delegation when negotiations begin.

As Minister of Renewable Resources, in discussion with department officials and the other participants in the domestic agreement, I am proposing that the international agreement should reflect a strong commitment to:

- maintenance of the health, productivity and use of the herd;
- conservation of the herd's habitat, including specific management regimes for sensitive areas, such as calving grounds;
- representation of caribou users on any bilateral management committees;
- negotiation of harvest allocation should reflect traditional uses of caribou;
- retention of existing jurisdictional authority. Bilateral committees should deal only with issues that are international in scope;
- continued reliance on the existing management committee and procedure built into the domestic agreement, rather than developing a completely separate international board or committee;
- any new bilateral committees that are established will be only advisory to the Ministers, although the Minister will be publicly accountable for the decisions taken.

In addition, we are suggesting that:

- any commercial harvest should be limited to special circumstances as prescribed in the existing Canadian Caribou Management Agreement. Big game outfitting should continue to be permitted;
- open hunting should not be permitted across the international border, but export of gifts and exchange among people, or their offspring, who have traditionally participated in this activity should be permitted. This recognizes that close ties continue to exist between Old Crow, Fort Yukon and several communities in the Northwest Territories.

We believe that it is appropriate to pursue an international agreement to ensure the long term welfare of this critically important renewable resource.

Moving now to the wood bison transplant, another significant initiative taken by my department was the reintroduction of wood bison into the Yukon. This project was initiated in 1983 and involved the cooperative efforts of the Department of Renewable Resources, the Canadian Wildlife Service, the Yukon Outfitters Association and the Yukon Fish and Game Association. Also involved were volunteer groups such as Katimavik. Thirty-four bison were transplanted. We are pleased to announce that the herd is as productive as we hoped. I am informed, as of this afternoon, that four new calves are breathing the fine air of the Nisling valley and we hope for many more.

A Fish and Wildlife Branch employee is now on site to maintain surveillance over the herd. The age structure of the transplanted bison herd is such that a quick build up of the population is possible. The long-term goal is for a free-ranging, self-sustaining herd of 400 bison to be established in the Nisling River valley.

In order to show the public how the transplant was carried out, my department has produced a video presentation on the project. It shows the steps in the transplant from the loading of the bison at Elk Island Park to their release in the Yukon. In the future, additional footage will be added, showing the calving and breeding period, the bison release into the wild, and the eventual well-established herd.

This project is only one of a number of cooperative efforts that

the Fish and Wildlife Branch is participating in. Projects like this, not only diversify and enrich local wildlife populations in the Yukon, but also help to contribute to national and international conservation efforts. Once again, our commitment to the principles of the World Conservation Strategy, the Task Force on Northern Conservation, and sustainable development is demonstrated in a tangible manner. I believe the foresight of the Members opposite in initiating this project is quite commendable.

A similar program for transfer of elk from Elk Island National Park to the Yukon is envisioned to occur hopefully by January of 1987.

²⁶ Elk Island has reaffirmed that we are at the head of the list to receive animals. The plan calls for the containment of the original stock and release of the progeny at one year of age.

Half of the elk would be released to the wild and the other half would be made available as potential game farm stock on a cost recovery basis.

As the Assembly is aware, we have been and are still involved in further predator program programs.

The Moose/Predator Control Program in southwest Yukon was initiated in 1981. Aerial surveys during the fall indicated poor calf survival in the moose population. In 1983, an investigation into the causes and notes of calf mortality indicated that predation primarily by grizzly bears and secondarily by wolves was responsible for the low calf survival cumulative impact of predation includes man. Following this, a study was designed to determine how various combinations of grizzly bear and wolf control would affect moose calf survival. The underlying purpose of this work was to increase moose numbers in Game Zones 7 and 9, and in doing so determine the most effective and efficient predator reduction strategies.

Our investment to date in this Moose/Predator Program has yielded much valuable information.

We have learned much better understanding about the principle factors influencing moose numbers in the Yukon and the magnitude of each factor.

We have established inventory procedures and have assessed moose numbers and recruitment rates in Game Zones 7 and 9, and we cannot manage them more effectively. We have established inventory procedures and have determined wolf numbers, pack structure and relationships, and we have developed efficient and effective techniques to substantially reduce numbers and monitor their response and recovery. We have a much better understanding of grizzly bear numbers, distributions and productivity. These data will be used to fine tune our harvestable surplus management strategy for grizzlies in the southwest Yukon. We are assessing the impact of wolf control on other species such as sheep and caribou populations in this area, and this work is continuing. We intend to assess the impact of the program to date on both the moose and wolf populations, and this will greatly add to our understanding of the dynamic relationships that exist between moose and their predators.

We have gathered this information, but we are extremely concerned about the cost effectiveness of the program and the long term effect on the grizzly bear population. There are a great many unknowns in our understandings of the population dynamics of these species. As you are aware, we have suspended the Control Program, at least until we have completed an evaluation of what has occurred and until we have considered alternative measures and have received the recommendations of the Select Committee on Renewable Resources.

As you are all aware, the southwest Yukon is the most heavily hunted area by Yukon hunters. The management cost per moose produced in that area is quite high. There are far more effective ways to allow the species to recover. Human hunting is, in effect, an extremely heavy form of predation, and it may be more effective to distribute this pressure to other areas of the Yukon.

In addition to the Moose/Predator Program in southwest Yukon, we have continued the five-year Finlayson Caribou Program, which, as the Members opposite will recall, was implemented in 1983 to control the decline of this important herd.

This spring, the control target of 50 wolves was achieved; 48 wolves were shot by our staff in the first week of March, and local

hunters and trappers took five wolves. Since that time, this afternoon, I have updated those figures, and the total is now 58.

Staff have recently censused this herd, carrying out herd counts on randomly selected blocks within the study area in March. These new counts have shown that the herd has increased to 3,000 animals. With continued management efforts we will see a steady increase in this population, which will benefit all Yukoners.

I would like to take a few minutes to reacquaint the Members or the events and details of the negotiations during the past year on the Yukon River Salmon talks. As Members know, the Pacific Salmon Treaty was signed by Canada and the United States during the Shamrock Conference involving Prime Minister Mulroney and President Reagan on March 17, 1985.

Despite the serious concerns on the part of the Yukon, the federal government insisted that the agreement be signed without the issues of equity and accounting of the harvest being resolved. As a consequence, this left the Yukon in the untenable position of having very little leverage in negotiating equitable rights in the salmon harvest with our Alaska neighbours who share some of the Yukon River route.

Since I assumed the position of Minister of Renewable Resources last spring, I have taken a very considerable personal interest in the issue and have made very strong representation to the federal government as well as to representatives of the Alaska State Legislature.

In order to repair the damage done to the territory's interest in the Yukon River Salmon talks, because of the haste of the signing of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, I think that we have a very difficult position from which to bargain. The prospects for an immediate agreement do not look good.

We are negotiating using five basic principles: one, to establish a management structure or structures to provide for the integrated Canada-United States arrangement for a share of stocks of Yukon chinook, coho and chum salmon; two, to establish a scientific committee to enable the exchange of scientific data to support and assess progress under the Fishery Management Program; three, to determine general targets for the maintenance of each salmon stock and allocation of harvest; four, to determine an equitable allocation of allowable harvest between the two nations; five, the United States is to account for a percentage of salmon reared in Canadian waters that are harvested by United States fishermen.

The two critical principles of equity and accounting of the harvest were driven home. It was our position that the equity principle is recognized internationally in the Law of the Sea discussions and should therefore apply to the Salmon Treaty. This means that the nation that rears the fish should have primary access to the harvest and any other nation that harvests such fish should have to account for its take.

In general, we felt encouraged by the early meetings and looked forward to some real movement on the part of the negotiators during future talks. Tough bargaining is the order of the day, and we are still assessing the Alaskan position prior to determining our strategy for the upcoming October meeting.

We recently participated for the first time in the North Pacific Salmon Commission talks with the Japanese and Americans on matters relating to salmon use and management beyond the Yukon River system. We were successful in making a strong representation that the reduction in harvest by Japan in the Bering Sea of the Yukon River origin salmon ought to accrue primarily to Yukoners.

The habitat management unit of the Lands, Parks and Resources Branch was transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Branch last winter as their work related primarily to wildlife habitat management. The goal of this unit is to protect and maintain the land and water resource base upon which fish and wildlife depend.

Its objectives are: to develop and maintain an inventory of fish and wildlife habitat; to develop an overall strategy for habitat management; to implement habitat management strategies; to maintain a continually updated land use inventory and monitoring program needed for conflict identification and resolution; and, to encourage suitable reclamation measures in order to improve the aesthetic environment and preserve fish and wildlife habitat.

²⁸ The unit is involved in such projects as: gathering baseline data

on the ecology of Herschel Island, in support of the process to establish the Island as a Territorial Park; the Dempster Highway reclamation project between kilometres 80 and 126 on the highway; reviews of proposed projects referred to the Land Use Advisory Committee; and, the identification and mapping of critical wildlife habitat. In addition, the unit has already developed a strong relationship with Habitat Canada. This will involve their support of our field projects for wildlife resource management planning that will have direct relevance to several communities.

As Minister, I am quite encouraged by the work of this small but dedicated group of individuals. Our goal of maintaining and protecting a high quality environment is dependent on this very important work.

The Wildlife Advisory Committee is presently structured to provide the Minister with advice on the administration of the *Wildlife Act*, particularly regulation and policy amendments.

Membership presently includes Fish and Game Association, Yukon Trappers Association, Yukon Outfitters Association, National Firearms Association, CYI, Yukon Conservation Society, and the Yukon Livestock and Agricultural Association.

It is my intention to examine the function and membership of this most important committee. I am confident that the committee can be restructured so as to meet the needs of users as well as our long-term conservation objectives. Committees such as this are the keystone to the well-structured, meaningful public participation program to which we are committed. Specifically, I envision being advised by the Board on all matters related to fish and wildlife programs, policies and legislation.

There are a number of other new and continuing field research projects funded in the 1986-87 fiscal year that I would like to highlight.

Number one, identifying sheep critical areas and providing guidelines to minimize harassment. There is a lack of information and management strategies concerning critical areas for sheep and goats. Specifically, we require guidelines to control disturbance of these key species and their critical habitats by resource development projects and other human activities. Too often we are asked to advise land-use boards on the importance of specific areas to wildlife, with virtually no information available to use.

We also have a limited information base by which to suggest mitigative measures in response to land-use activities.

A project is being undertaken to determine the location of mineral licks, lambing cliffs and winter ranges and to establish criteria for evaluating the consequences of various human disturbances and to produce recommendations concerning disturbances on thinnhorn sheep in Yukon.

As to the effect of wolf predation on Dall sheep, preliminary wolf work suggests that wolves may be important Dall sheep predators, particularly in late winter. Further, it has been suggested that sheep may provide an alternate food supply for wolves, allowing wolf population levels to be sustained and preventing the recovery of moose numbers. It is the intention of this study to determine if wolves have a significant influence on Dall sheep productivity and survival.

On the reintroduction of mountain goats to Mount White, 12 mountain goats have been relocated to Mt. White near Jakes Corner with the intention of re-establishing a population of goats in that area. This mountain is visible from both the Alaska Highway and the Atlin Road and so provides an excellent opportunity to enhance non-consumptive use of wildlife. In order to evaluate the success of the re-introduction it is necessary to monitor the survivorship and the reproductive success of the new population. Ten goats were fitted with radio collars providing an ideal opportunity to monitor the fate of the relocated goats as well as to document demographic changes over time, and range use patterns.

As of February, 1986, all radio-collared goats were alive. In addition, two kids, produced last spring, were alive.

One mortality is known to have occurred; a male kid transplanted in 1983 died in October of that year. The fate of one young male without a radio collar is unknown. He just may be sitting in Riverdale South.

A signpost has been constructed and will be positioned on the

Atlin Road to increase public awareness to the mountain goat transplant. The signpost credits both YTG and the Yukon Fish and Game Association with the success of the projects.

Number 4, assessment of the status and the potential limiting factors of the Glenlyon Sheep population:

It was drawn to our attention by Belle Desrosiers, an outfitter in the area, in both 1983 and 1984, that the Stone sheep population of the Glenlyon range may not be faring well. The outfitter has noted population declines, sheep disappearing from traditional areas, a decline in group size, and poor lamb crops over the last number of years. The annual harvest since 1981 has ranged from nine to eleven animals. Since 1981, there has been a decline in average age from 9.5 to 6.78 and a drop in average horn length from 35.88 to 33.70 inches. These data reinforce the outfitter's contention that the sheep population has suffered in the last few years.

Sheep have not been well studied in the Yukon and the only available information we have for this area is a population count from surveys carried out in 1976. What is necessary is a detailed examination of sheep in the Glenlyon Mountains to determine population size, composition, productivity, and patterns of range use in order to assess the status and the potential limiting factors of the population.

Number five, monitoring of sheep harvest:

Sheep harvest data can be used to assess sheep status by tracking trends in the number killed and the age structure of the kill. Furthermore, detailed harvest reports can be made available to the public, and an assessment of lumpy jaw can be made.

Lab services will be used to collect information pertaining to kill location and data, age, horn growth measurements, and lumpy jaw assessment. The information will then be entered into the computer and analyzed.

Number six, the ecology of Dall sheep in Northern Yukon:

As a response to the proposed oil and gas development on the Beaufort Sea and potential developments in the North Coast area, a proposal was made to the federal government to investigate a northern population of sheep. It was suggested by biologists in the Northwest Territories that sheep in the northern Richardsons had seriously declined since the early 1970s. Sheep numbers are currently unknown. A study is in progress to investigate sheep population size and composition, survival rates and seasonal movements. The NOGAP funds, provided by the federal government, are used to support this project.

Preliminary results in the study indicate that the population has recovered beyond previous estimates. Currently, we estimate, with a high degree of certainty, that there are over 630 sheep in the northern Richardson Mountains.

Chairman: Mr. Lang on a point of order.

Mr. Lang: Could the Minister speak a little louder? He has a tendency to mumble as he is reading.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will dismiss the personal nature of the comment.

Mrs. Firth: I am having difficulty listening to the Member. There are only two headpieces here. There was no personal intention made. If he could be so kind as to read with some enthusiasm and a bit louder, I would really appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I was going to make this available, but I cannot get it out. I will attempt to speak up, but it is a very long speech. The Members opposite are complaining about the length of the speech, but I am trying to give the Members as much information as can be made available for their benefit and for the public. Can we get on with the business, Mr. Chairman?

Mrs. Firth: On the same point of order, it is the Minister who has brought his speech forward. We are certainly interested in the information. I am interested in listening to it, but not having the benefit of an earpiece here, I am simply asking the Minister to speak a little louder. I do not think we are asking for a lot.

Surely, if the Member feels that strongly about his presentation, he will not see any objection to that at all.

Chairman: There is no point of order. I would ask the Member to please speak clearly when he is giving his presentation. Continue.

Mrs. Firth: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The population characteristics, productivity, mortality rates appear very similar to that of populations elsewhere. A report has been written and is currently being reviewed.

The wolf-Dall sheep studies are intended to document wolf—Dall Sheep relationships in the Kluane Game Sanctuary in conjunction with other sheep—wolf studies and to improve our knowledge of wolf predation and limiting the sheep populations in the Yukon. The project involves continuing the intensive monitoring of radio—instrumented wolf packs to document late winter predation rates of sheep and document age and class selection. A substantial amount of the funding for this project is provided by the North American Wild Sheep Foundation.

The Wood Bison Wolf Research and Management Project is a project to examine potential relationships of a resident wolf population and the introduced wood bison herd. From the collection of ecological data, the Fish and Wildlife Branch will be in a responsible position to assess and develop dependable wolf—bison strategies.

The Finalyson Wolf Population Inventory and Reduction: as part of the Finalyson Caribou herd management strategy, a major objective is to inventory and remove 70 percent of the annual wolf population in order to increase caribou calf survivorship and to aid recovery of the herd. This is a continuation of the previous year's program.

The wolf studies in Game Management Zone 7 and 9 are part of the Moose—Predator Study. A major objective is to document the effects of the reduction of the population status and subsequent rate of recovery of the distributed wolf population.

During the summer study period, May to August, we will locate the dens of the eight radio-instrumented wolf packs and determine productivity and then visit dens to determine litter size and collect prey remains to determine summer food habits.

During the fall and winter study period, we will determine early winter and late winter wolf density in the 11,000-square-kilometre study area, determine prey selection during winter periods and territorial spacing of recovering wolf population, and determine the annual rate of increase of wolf population and potential effects on resident ungulates in the area.

Determine Population Size and Productivity of Porcupine Caribou Herd:

³¹ Baseline population data are essential to define the limits of growth and to prescribe levels of safe harvest. A new census is necessary to assess population status and, if necessary, to determine a sustainable limit of harvest. Population census is achieved by photographing the herd during the post-calving period when caribou tend to aggregate. This technique is dependent on the degree to which concentration of the herd occurs. The periodic monitoring of some-150 radio-collared individuals and the eventual concentration of radio-marked animals will indicate the degree of aggregation.

Vertical and/or oblique photographs will be taken dependent on the nature of the terrain where the animals aggregate. All one-year-plus individuals will be counted from the photographs. A photo census is assumed to be a near total of the herd.

A simultaneous ground composition survey of major caribou groups will provide a ratio of bulls to cows to help verify the completeness of the aggregation, as well as a ratio of calves to cows to indicate productivity.

This will provide important information for the Porcupine Management Board. Funding has been provided by NOGAP, but Renewable Resources personnel will carry out the work.

Number twelve, distribution and mortality patterns of the Porcupine Caribou Herd:

One hundred and fifty caribou are presently radio-collared, of which 30 are of known age. Periodic tracking will allow us to determine survivorship rates from which we can calculate adult mortality and age-specific mortality of one cohort of animals. Also, seasonal distribution can be determined from the radio-collared individuals. Further, if we can determine the distribution of caribou in relation to the Dempster Highway, it will allow enforcement officers to closely monitor the Dempster harvest. This is also funded by NOGAP.

Number thirteen, Upland Game Bird Management Studies:

Two sharp-tailed grouse dancing grounds in the Burwash area will be observed to determine population trends; four reference populations of willow ptarmigan will be measured for density and reproductive success in the Coast Mountains, Tungsten area, Ogilvie Mountains and North Slope areas; and hunter data and harvest statistics will be analyzed for the last five years.

Number fourteen, Peregrine Falcon Recovery Project:

Ten to twelve young falcons will be produced in Whitehorse from the Yukon territorial government breeding stock at the Yukon Game Farm. These young will be fostered to gyrfalcons on the North Slope in June. A major review of this project is due in the current year to determine effectiveness, accomplishments to date and plans for the future.

The two major objectives are: a) to contribute the Yukon's portion to the major North American peregrine surveys conducted every five years. This survey is vital to monitoring the status of this endangered species. b) to complete the final year of attempted reintroduction of the tundra peregrine on the Yukon's North Slope.

Number fifteen, wetland inventory and waterfowl management planning:

This program has several components including: provision of YTG input into cooperative waterfowl and wetland management programs throughout the Yukon. Cooperating agencies include the Canadian Wildlife Service, Ducks Unlimited, and Habitat Canada. A "Yukon Waterfowl working group" meets regularly. Counts of waterfowl staging in spring and fall in areas near Whitehorse and accessible to Whitehorse hunters are conducted. A waterfowl-use analysis is in its second and final year on the Needlerock wetland near Carmacks.

³² Three total-coverage air counts and 10 to 15 days of ground work analyzing nesting habitat are planned.

Broad coverage of northern wetlands — Old Crow Flats, Yukon coastal marshes — will be conducted.

Low intensity work on the staging of waterfowl at Nisutlin Bay, Teslin will continue.

The department has developed an effective working relationship with Ducks Unlimited, which has been operating in the Yukon for the past year. Management plans are being developed for several key waterfowl production and staging areas.

In furbearer management and trapline development, records of furbearer harvests are being maintained for fur management and economic planning purposes. Baseline data will be collected on various key furbearers to aid trapline development planning as well as to support broader strategies for optimal use of fur resources.

A population and pelt quality study of muskrats in the Old Crow Flats is being conducted with the people of Old Crow as a basis for the planned enhanced use of this key renewable resource in that area.

The transplant of marten on a number of traplines and, more generally, development of appropriate management plans in south-west Yukon is continuing.

A program to monitor lynx harvest and a population study of this species is being conducted to enable us to reassess our current harvest management practices. The importance of this study is clear, as international attention has recently focussed on this species.

Our trapper training program is providing up-to-date information to our trappers to ensure that the most humane and efficient trapping methods are used, the highest pelt value is received, and to ensure appropriate exchange of information on fur management programs. Four-day workshops will be held in six communities, in addition to many evening meetings throughout the Yukon and an intensive seven-day workshop at the end of the year. Two trapline and species management brochures are also planned to be produced.

Moving to Lands, Parks and Resources Branch: as the Members opposite are aware, the Lands, Parks and Resources Branch has two major resource management programs carried out by the Parks Unit and the Regional Planning Unit. As well, we undertake a series of responsibilities related to federal-territorial land use regulations including the Federal-Territorial Lands Advisory Committee, the Land Use Advisory Committee and the Regional Environmental Review Committee.

The Parks Unit is responsible for the planning, development and maintenance of the territorial campground network and, more recently, has embarked on the development of a park system plan.

The Regional Planning Unit has a series of special responsibilities, but primarily the unit will be our government's link to the Yukon Land Use Planning Program.

I would now like to highlight a number of projects and programs that will be significant components of the work of the branch during 1986-87.

The Yukon Land Use Planning Agreement has been negotiated between the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and this government and is presently in the process of final approval by both governments. The agreement provides for the general participation of all residents in the planning process. The Land Use Planning program will apply to all lands in any planning region and will provide for uses required by area residents to be accommodated. The federal government will provide the staff and funding to start the program, following the final signing of the agreement. We are very optimistic about the potential for this program and the very real opportunities for participation by Yukoners.

It is also very important to point out that Land Use Planning is a process without predetermined outcomes.

It will allow us to make informed and balanced choices about land uses, ensuring that many potential uses for an area are considered, providing for an optimal mix of uses rather than simply using land in an ad hoc, unplanned manner.

As we are all aware, the responsibility for the management of the Yukon's forests is primarily a federal responsibility. The Lands, Parks and Resources Branch has responsibility for management of fuelwood on YTG lands, and, of course, the habitat group of the Fish and Wildlife Branch considers the nature of the forest ecosystem in their work.

These are two small programs, but management of forest resources is high on the list that will be discussed at the devolution table with the federal government. As an agreement is reached on the transfer of forest management responsibilities, the operations of the department, with respect to forest issues, will become more complex and wider ranging.

I have directed the department to review the management requirements for the future of the forest and other resources. This planning effort will provide the detailed background that will be needed for negotiations with the federal government.

There is no one in this House who has not, at one time or another, enjoyed the facilities and the natural beauty of our territorial campgrounds. Building on a number of years of planning and investigation, the Department of Renewable Resources is continuing its work on managements options for a park at Coal River Springs and on the establishment of Herschel Island Territorial Park. At the same time, it is planning new campgrounds in a number of locations, including Quiet Lake, Five Mile Lake and the Dempster Highway. As you are aware, these are items that are undertaken in the capital side of our budgetary exercise.

As you all know, the funding for the construction of these parks and campgrounds was voted in the previous Capital Budget in most instances, and, on occasion, through special allocations, such as the money made available for Herschel Island through the implementation funds approved for and flowing from the Inuvialuit funding agreement.

However, while development and construction is undertaken with capital funds, the broader management and strategic planning of the campground and parks system is provided for in the O&M Budget.

There are a number of points that should be emphasized in looking at our parks program. The first is that the parks section is committed to the development of a Parks System Plan that will allow for the careful and considered development of future territorial parks in areas throughout the Yukon. This Park System Plan, as it is being developed over the course of the next year, will be integrated into a broader wilderness recreation strategy, which the department has also started to work on. This wilderness recreation strategy will be developed in close consultation with Tourism and in close consultation with the outfitters, wilderness

guides, and other user groups.

Indeed, the opportunity for a broad-based public input on park plans and the park planning process is one of the fundamental principles that will guide our ongoing work in this area.

I am pleased to again speak to our participation in the Canadian Heritage River Program. Our involvement, once again, demonstrates our commitment to implement the recommendations of the Task Force on Northern Conservation. I previously commented to you in some detail on this program, but it is appropriate to reiterate some of the highlights. By the inclusion of Yukon Rivers in a single coast-to-coast system, they become representative of Canada's river heritage as a whole, thus reflecting a recognition of natural, and possibly international significance.

The value of Canadian heritage rivers is determined according to three sets of heritage value guidelines: natural, human and recreational. The nominated river may be included in the system if it meets one or more of the heritage value guidelines as well as a set of integrity guidelines. These guidelines are as follows: the national heritage development value guidelines; human heritage value guidelines; outstanding recreation values; and, natural values.

It is clear that there are many of Yukon's rivers that could potentially qualify for inclusion in this system. The Alsek River, within Kluane Park, is now part of the CHRS and the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River is being considered. As you are aware, we participated in a major overview study on the Yukon's rivers to determine their potential for inclusion in this system, and we will be continuing to refine this understanding.

Finding an appropriate mix of recreational and other economic uses for our rivers will be a challenging and an extremely interesting task that we are approaching with enthusiasm.

I would like to conclude my remarks on this particular branch by indicating my commitment to the principles of the report of the Task Force on Northern Conservation. As you are aware, this task force included Yukon members of both the conservation and mining communities in particular. They recommended that a series of protected areas be established, with the Land Use Planning Program being used as the principle method of implementation. A major message of this report was the optimism that protected areas and mining could co-exist in the Yukon. With appropriate planning, there need not be many direct conflicts between these interests.

We too are optimistic. In an area like the Tatshenshini River Valley, for example, it is clear that a transportation corridor and a recreation corridor can be incorporated without undue impact on one another. The Cabinet of the Government of British Columbia endorsed the recommendations of the Williams Wilderness Committee last week. That committee recommended protection for the river and more planning for a potential road corridor. To do this requires research, planning and extensive cooperation with other governments, including the Yukon. A good compromise can be reached.

Chairman: Order, please. Before we proceed, we will recess for 15 minutes.

Recess

Chairman: I will call Committee back to order. Please continue.

Hon. Mr. Porter: First I would like to extend my apologies to Members opposite with respect to their comments regarding the clarity of the speech. I checked with my Caucus members, and also members of the staff who were listening, and I admit that I was rather unclear. I apologize. I did not think I was unclear, but obviously I was. I will try to be much clearer as I finish the speech.

The next branch I would like to discuss is the Agricultural Branch.

Agriculture has long been practiced in the Yukon. Crops were grown in the territory as early as the gold rush era. Agricultural research programs began almost as early and have continued in an intermittent manner over the years. In recent years, YTG has assumed a growing role in research programs in cooperation with Agriculture Canada.

In 1983, an Agriculture Advisor was hired on contract by the

Government of Yukon to investigate further the possibilities for successful agricultural pursuits in the various areas of the Yukon. We are carrying out these studies to help determine the kinds and varieties of crops that can be grown. In addition, the Agriculture Advisor and other departmental staff members have been providing information services related to the production of field crops, vegetable crops, livestock and poultry.

In response to the growing needs of the agriculture industry, our government has moved to create a new Agriculture Branch within the Department of Renewable Resources. Initially, there will be four staff positions in the new branch: a Director of Agriculture, an Agriculture Development Officer, a part-time Agricultural Inspector and a part-time Agriculture Secretary.

The new Director will report to the Deputy Minister for Renewable Resources. The duties will include coordinating a comprehensive agricultural extension education programme, developing and coordinating experimental and demonstration crop programmes, providing the scientific and technical information required by the agricultural community and providing assistance to individuals and groups involved in the production and marketing of agricultural products.

The new Agriculture Development Officer will report to the Director of the Agriculture Branch. The duties of the position will include providing assistance and information on methods and procedures for the proper clearing and breaking of land for agricultural purposes; providing information on the use, maintenance, operation and repair of agriculture equipment; accepting land applications and inspecting lands for agricultural and grazing capability; participating with the clients and director in the review of these applications and assisting the director with the review of farm management proposals.

³⁶ We anticipate staffing the two other part-time positions in the near future.

The agricultural inspector will be responsible for enforcing the regulations under the *Agricultural Products Act* and other related legislation. Part-time secretarial support will also be required. The budget for the new Agriculture Branch includes \$132,000 for salaries and \$85,000 for operating and maintenance expenditures.

This government is committed to the development of the agricultural sector in cooperation with industry representatives. We will be supporting the activities of the Agricultural Planning Advisory Committee and its initiatives in policy development. The committee will be directly involved in the development of agricultural product regulations and in policy development on agricultural land protection and livestock control. Papers on these issues have been developed and the public consultation process will commence shortly.

This government is also committed to support for the New Crop Development Program in cooperation with the Yukon Livestock and Agricultural Association and Agriculture Canada. We are entering the second field season of this important three year project aimed at determining the adaptability of various agricultural and horticultural crops to the Yukon's varied climatic zones. A variety of potato, vegetable, grass, legume and cereal crops are being investigated at 10 trial plots located throughout the territory.

The *Agricultural Products Act* will be the focal point for this government's legislative initiatives in agriculture in the coming years. We will be proclaiming Agricultural Product Appeal Board Regulations in the near future, and working with agricultural industry representatives on meat inspection regulations.

The Agricultural Products Appeal Board will determine the fair market value of seized products when called upon to do so, and hear appeals from decisions and orders of inspectors. It will be a five member board that will work within a defined timeframe once an appeal or other matter has been referred to it.

³⁷ This government has previously announced a Land Availability Program in a cooperative manner with the federal government and the CYI. The Department of Renewable Resources established a special task force to expedite review of agricultural applications within the framework of the Land Availability Program.

A four person departmental committee has been formed with the priority mandate to develop a responsive method of processing

applications, as well as reviewing as many applications as possible within the next two months.

We believe these steps within the department and within the government will dramatically improve the land availability situation.

The Policy and Planning Branch was established in August, 1984 to fill a very important gap in the ability of the department to undertake a series of necessary projects that were clearly not part of the line responsibilities of the other branches. These projects include: development of a permanent strategic plan for environmental management; preparation for devolution; information and education; implementation of the Northern Conservation Task Force recommendations; and, many others.

I want to highlight a number of the branch's activities, and I believe that this will serve to explain many of the budget components that we will be dealing with later.

Possibly, the most important initiative within the Policy and Planning Branch is our work on a strategic plan and on preparation for transfers of renewable resources management responsibilities from the federal government to our government. It has long been the goal of Yukoners to take over the management of all of our territory's renewable resources, and we are working toward that goal.

While we await the report of the Select Committee on Renewable Resources, I have directed my department to undertake background work that will help in the development of a strategic plan and to begin background studies on the issues associated with transfers. We are looking at five main areas: freshwater fisheries, forestry, water management, land management and environmental protection. We are examining issues such as the constitutional and legal questions, the potential benefits to the Yukon, the potential for decentralizing the resource management services once transferred, and how the transfers will affect the influence of Yukoners on land-use decisions in the territory. We will also consult with affected groups to hear their concerns, and we will consider the views of the public as expressed through the Select Committee public hearings.

I have directed my department to give priority to the transfer of freshwater fisheries, management responsibilities and forest management responsibilities. Members of this Legislative Assembly, from both sides of the floor, have spoken to the importance of the freshwater fishery resource to the Yukon economy.

When the Yukon government takes over management of freshwater fisheries in the Yukon, my department will be involved in the management of all non-anadromous fish in all Yukon lakes and rivers — these are other than the species that inhabit saltwater and migrate to freshwater — including management of the sport harvest, Indian food harvest, commercial harvests and domestic food harvests.

We have identified two immediate management needs: a catch-up program involving a resource inventory and user demand study, which would take a minimum of three years, and then development of fisheries management plans, following the completion of the inventory and other necessary studies.

We have begun to plan the department's goals for the management of the freshwater fisheries resource. Although this subject will also be covered in the Select Committee's recommendations, I feel that the transfer of the freshwater fisheries resource is of such importance to Yukoners that the department must begin preparations for assumption of the responsibility. The goals of our freshwater fishery management would likely be: to maximize recreational, cultural and economic benefits for the Yukon; to maintain or increase fish stocks; to protect and maintain or improve fish habitat; to introduce species where necessary and desirable; and to meet user demands where these are consistent with the government's social and economic goals.

³⁸ My department also is examining closely the issues associated with the transfer of forest management responsibilities. Forest management is a provincial-type responsibility that is currently administered on federal lands in the Yukon by DIAND. DIAND's role in forest management also includes fire management. Our government is responsible for management of forest resources on

Commissioner's lands. Obtaining the responsibility for forest management across the whole territory would move the Yukon toward fuller resource management control. It would also allow our government to establish policies, priorities and programs that are in keeping with the Yukon's needs.

To this end, my department is reviewing the issues associated with the forestry transfer. My deputy minister has been attending a series of federal-provincial-territorial forest management conferences in order to help prepare the department for assumption of forest management responsibilities. I have written to the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Honourable David Crombie, requesting that the Yukon and federal governments enter into a more formal discussion on the transfers. Working-level contact has now been firmly established between my department and DIAND's regional offices.

My department will be working in close cooperation with other departments and with the Office of Devolution. Our strategy for transfer of renewable resource management responsibility will be coordinated within the overall approach to devolution taken by our government. Development of the department's strategy is at an early stage. While we are continuing to carry out important background work, we will not complete any aspects of the Strategic Plan for these or other resources until the Select Committee on Renewable Resources makes its report to the Legislative Assembly. However, because of the great importance of this matter to the people of the Yukon, devolution will continue to be a high priority for both me and my department in the next year. The budget for this work consists of personal time allocations within the Policy and Planning Branch.

The question of the functions and responsibilities of my department's policy analysts has arisen in the House in the past, and I would like to address the issue briefly here.

There are currently two new policy analyst positions in the Department of Renewable Resources, in addition to the permanent position that has existed since Policy and Planning was established in August 1984. They report to the Director of the Policy and Planning Branch. One of the new positions is permanent; the second is a contract position. I think the best way of explaining their functions is to look at what they have done in the past and at their current tasks.

The new permanent policy analyst has been closely involved with the Select Committee's public hearings on the future of the Yukon's renewable resources, which, I am proud to say, was one of the most successful public consultation processes ever held in the Yukon.

This policy analyst is continuing to work on the development of a strategic plan for the future of the Department of Renewable Resources. This plan will provide a new operational context for the activities of the department, both for existing responsibilities and as new programs are devolved from the federal government. The plan will also provide the framework for our response to the Select Committee on Renewable Resources incorporating their various recommendations. We are confident that the strategic planning exercise will provide for more focussed and efficient departmental operations.

In addition to this core responsibility this policy analyst has worked with the community of Old Crow on the preparation of a presentation to the World Conservation Strategy Conference being held in Ottawa the end of this month and the beginning of this month; has developed a submission to the World Commission on Environment and Development; and, has prepared the department's submission to the Placer Mining Review Committee.

At present he is coordinating a series of policy development activities with respect to territorial water policy, including a response to the Federal Inquiry on Water Policy; a response to the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers water quality study and the National Water Policy under development by Environment Canada; and, working on options regarding the development of a YTG-based environmental assessment and review process.

³⁹ The second new policy analyst position, the contract position, is concentrating on the question of resource transfers and the many related issues that I described earlier. Other policy issues associated

with devolution that this policy analyst has dealt with include coordinating the department's review of resource issues related to land claims negotiations, reviewing Arctic waters protection legislation and coordinating the department's response to the Neilsen Task Force Report. Other duties of this position have included working on agricultural policy development and preparing a discussion paper on the future of the Yukon's fur resource, which I tabled with the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development when it visited Whitehorse at the end of April.

The original permanent policy analyst, who has been with the branch since its inception, also has a series of very significant and time consuming tasks. These have included participation in the Yukon River Salmon Negotiations; the Porcupine Caribou Herd Management Agreement; the Arctic Water Advisory Committee and various subcommittees; the redraft of the *Wildlife Act*; the new Agriculture Land Review Process; and many others. While not new, all of these tasks are absolutely essential if the department is to assume the lead role in resource management in the Yukon.

The Department of Renewable Resources is at an important transitional stage in its development. As we prepare to assume new responsibilities for the management of the Yukon's renewable resources, we will need to develop a broadened range of policies to guide these new management responsibilities. The department's policy analysts play an important role in the detailed nitty gritty of policy development.

One of the most obvious connections between our government's basic theme of economic diversification and the renewable resource sector is provided by the EDA. The Renewable Resources Subsidiary Agreement between Canada and the Yukon government is designed to improve and expand the Yukon's renewable resource industries. The subagreement provides for \$4.2 million in funding to be allocated over four years. The specific sectors covered by the subagreement are wildlife, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and wilderness recreation ventures. Two types of proposals may be funded under this subagreement: demonstration projects, and studies or inventories aimed at improving business opportunities in five sectors.

The Department of Renewable Resources is co-chairing the Subagreement Management Committee with DIAND and is administering the renewable resources program. Administrative support is provided by the Business Development Office where the One Stop Business Shop works with applicants and coordinates the paperwork on applications as they are reviewed and processed by the Management Committee. My department is also working with other members of the Management Committee to develop sector-specific development strategies and to define program implementation procedures. Consultation and briefing with user groups is taking place at regular intervals.

By the end of the first fiscal year of operation, and up until the end of March, a total of 76 applications had been received: 25 in agriculture; eight in fisheries; 21 in wildlife; eight in forestry and 14 in wilderness recreation ventures. Of these, a total of 18 applications have been approved, for a commitment of \$575,144. These projects include greenhouse operations in Whitehorse and Mayo, trail clearing by the Champagne-Aishihik Band, and the acquisition of an elk herd and the development of a sod farm.

In the past six weeks, applications have continued to be submitted to the Management Committee on a regular basis. As an example, six applications were reviewed by the committee at its May 7, 1986 meeting.

The Policy and Planning Branch will be continuing its very active and very successful information and education programs and publications. Providing good information is absolutely essential if open government is expected to work and Renewable Resources does an excellent job. The program includes publishing resource bulletins, the *Campfire News*, hunting and fishing synopses and preparing brochures and video tapes of renewable resource management activities.

⁴⁰ Seventeen issues of the *Resources Bulletin* are planned for the 1986-87 fiscal year. Fifteen hundred copies of each new issue of the Resource Bulletin are printed. A new issue comes out about every three weeks, and the copies are distributed by a mailing list to

organizations, clubs, schools, libraries, YTG employees, federal government departments, YTG vendors and agents and the general public. The cost of printing these bulletins over the past year was \$3,458.30. The bulletins are written by departmental staff and are edited by the Information and Education Officer. The bulletins are a continuing publication program and provide the public with interesting, current and accurate information on the department's activities.

The *Yukon Campfire News* will be published again this year. Thirty thousand copies of this 12-page newspaper tabloid are being printed and will be distributed later this month to coincide with the opening of the territorial campground system. They will be distributed to Yukon residents through the local newspapers and to non-residents through Visitor Reception Centres and other outlets. Fifty-seven hundred dollars has been budgeted for this programme. The articles are being prepared by the Information and Education section in cooperation with the Lands, Parks and Resources Branch. The summer 1986 issue will provide users of the territorial campground system with information on the location and facilities of each campground, information on the Yukon's wildlife, plants, rocks and minerals, weather and other interesting features of the Yukon, as well as basic educational items on resource conservation.

My department will also be updating the Yukon hunting synopsis. Twenty thousand copies of the 1986-87 synopsis will be available to resident and non-resident hunters, both big and small game, prior to the August 1 opening of the season. Sixty-five hundred dollars has been budgeted for the hunting synopsis. The 1986-87 fishing and trapping synopses were completed under the 1985-86 budget.

My department will be publishing a new sport fishing brochure. With the transfer of freshwater fisheries management to the Yukon government, this brochure will be an excellent example of the importance of the resource and the government's concern for it. Sport anglers will learn not only about identifying fish species, but also about the management and importance of our freshwater fish stocks. Text has been written for the brochure, colour illustrations have been prepared, and photographs have been selected. Final revisions and the brochure's layout are now being done. It is estimated that the brochure will be published by August 1, 1986. To date, the brochure has cost \$5,705: \$4,500 for preparation of the text and \$1,205 for the colour illustrations. No final printing costs are available at this time as the printing contract has not yet been tendered.

My department is preparing a new, non-technical report on the Forty-Mile caribou herd. This report chronicles the history of the Forty-Mile caribou herd and its present importance to the people of the Yukon and Alaska. Following a call for bids, Doug Urquhart, a local biologist with extensive caribou experience, was hired to research and write the report. The service contract was for \$3,750 and was completed at the end of March. The report is now receiving final minor editing changes and illustrations and maps are being drafted. It is anticipated that the final report will be printed and available for distribution by August 1. Printing costs are estimated to be \$3,000.

The department is going to be publishing some trapline management brochures. This is a new series, first proposed in late 1985. The first draft of the text for the first two brochures, marten and lynx, was submitted in mid-February. It is anticipated that these first two brochures will be available to the trappers of the Yukon before October 1, when the new trapping season begins. Twenty-five hundred copies are being printed of each at a proposed cost of \$800 to \$1,000 for each brochure.

« Trappers are wildlife managers, regulating the number of animals in the traplines and surrounding area. These information brochures on the trapping and the management of the Yukon's furbearers are designed to assist trappers in managing their fur resources.

Our information education brochures are eagerly sought after by both residents and tourists. To meet public demand, many require reprinting during the year. Currently, the department has plans to reprint two brochures: 5,000 copies of Yukon Big Game Animals will be reprinted at a cost of \$4,500; and 10,000 copies of Resource Bulletin Volume 1, Number 10, Trapping Utilization of a Resource, will be reprinted at a cost of \$640.95.

These two publications have been requested by the Yukon Outfitters Association for incorporation into a trapping display at their information booth in Nuremberg, West Germany this summer.

My department is also looking at other forms of public information and communication. We are producing three videotapes of the Wood Bison Transplant Project. One is a 12-minute documentary-style video production, which is an account of the recent introduction of 34 wood bison into the Yukon. From footage taken of loading the bison at Elk Island National Park, at the release site on March 6 and during a subsequent visit to the corral on March 19, a VHS format video will be produced. A service contract to Logan Video Services for \$1,850 was awarded April 14, with a completion date of April 24.

A five-minute condensed version of the longer video will be produced for showing to an audience of 350 delegates from nations around the globe at the World Conservation Strategy Conference in Ottawa in May. Logan Video Services will produce this video at an additional cost, not to exceed \$500,000. This service contract with Logan Video Services has a completion date of April 24.

A further one-minute condensation of the above document video will be produced for national television coverage at CBC North broadcasting. Logan Video Services will produce the video at an additional cost, not to exceed \$500.

These videos will provide the public with an account of the Yukon government's participation in a conservation effort to save the wood bison through the establishment of another free ranging herd, with the objective of having the species removed from the endangered species list.

We are also producing a video of Old Crow. Using 42, 35mm slides taken last September by Richard Hartmier, a professional photographer from Whitehorse, we will produce a short one-minute video that will be shown at the World Conservation Strategy Conference in May, as well as on CBC North.

Old Crow is being used as a case study for the conference. This audio-visual production portrays the importance of the Porcupine caribou herd to the people of Old Crow and documents the care taken by the native hunters when harvesting the animals.

Another new communication program is a radio bulletin series. A proposal was brought forward by one of the Conservations Officers to have the department begin broadcasting brief renewable resources bulletins on Yukon radio stations.

Written and narrated by Conservation Officers from throughout the Yukon, these bulletins will generally consist of an update of renewable resource related topics, plus the mention of applicable regulations.

Public Affairs was made aware of the proposal and contact was made with the three radio stations. A demonstration tape of five radio sponsors was made by A.V. Action Ltd. for distribution to the stations.

The cost of this proposal will be as follows: studio time at \$45 per hour for A.V. Action Ltd., plus the cost of one four-inch reel to reel tape and \$17 per week times 50 weeks beginning April 25 for 1 to 1½ minute spots on CKRW.

« These radio bulletins will serve as reminders to resource user groups of regulations and season dates, to announce public meetings or workshops and to disseminate information and departmental projects and activities.

All these information and education projects represent a major commitment of the government to improved public and visitor understanding of conservation principles and each of our renewable resources. We have relied primarily on print media in the past, but these new audio-visual and video initiatives are a conscious effort to update the program and widen the audience. We will also broaden the content of the program as we address the growing responsibilities of the department.

I am very confident that these programs will continue to be effective and useful. Obviously, however, we will need to reassess our needs in future; as the range of departmental responsibilities increases there will be new and expanding information and education needs.

Another new information and education project is the Dempster Highway Nature Interpretive Centre. This interpretive centre will

provide travellers along the Dempster Highway with an opportunity to observe and learn more about the flora, fauna and natural features of the area. This will involve displays, audio-visual programmes, brochures and guided nature tours and wildlife viewing opportunities.

The interpretive center was developed by converting a 10 foot by 30 foot trailer. A service contract was awarded in February to Northern Biomes, a Yukon consulting company, to act as consultant, coordinator and facilitator in the design, preparation and installation of the trailer displays. The initial contract was \$4,500, and a further contract of \$1,500 was awarded to the same company for completion of the displays in the centre.

The Dempster Highway Nature Interpretive Centre will be placed at the Tombstone Campground. One naturalist will be on staff during the summer. Although the centre will continue to be located on the Dempster Highway, some of the displays are scheduled to be used at other events and locations when the centre is closed. Given the increasing recognition of the Dempster Highway as a destination tourism resource, it is particularly appropriate that we focus our information/education efforts on the Corridor.

We are continuing our development and support for Project WILD, which is an educational program sponsored by the Canadian Wildlife Federation that we are co-sponsoring in the Yukon. The program can provide teachers in the Yukon with an interdisciplinary, supplementary, environmental and conservation education program emphasizing wildlife and providing learning experiences for young people at the elementary school level.

The Department of Education has approved it for future implementation in Yukon schools, an information packet has been prepared and distributed to all school principals, provisions have been made to address these principals at their next Whitehorse meeting, and a copy of the contractual agreement has been received from the Canadian Wildlife Federation in Ottawa.

A total of \$5,500 has been budgetted for the 1986-87 fiscal year, and it is anticipated that 10 to 15 percent of the Information/Education officer's time would be required as coordinator.

In light of the fact that it involves working with youngsters, it provides an opportunity for the development of a conservation ethic and a basic understanding of wildlife and its role in nature and society. Project WILD is an excellent and efficient medium for enhancing our ongoing wildlife education efforts.

Chairman: Order, please. I remind Members of Standing Order 42(3), which states that no Member shall speak for more than 30 minutes at a time in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Lang: Are you sure that does not say 300 minutes?

Chairman: No, it says 30 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Penikett: On the same point of order, presumably if someone else gets up, like I am doing now, and speaks for another few seconds, the person who has the floor can then get up and speak for another 30 minutes.

Mr. Lang: That is fine, but I think the point is well taken with respect to the drawing up of the rules. The idea, principally, was in the Committee of the Whole for an individual putting their general point of view across in 30 minutes, so that there could be some time period for debate on the specifics of the issue. I think that is the relevant aspect of it. I think the Member for Whitehorse West would agree with me on that. It is a valid observation.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will try to finish in the additional 30 minutes granted.

The Department of Renewable Resources has been invited to prepare a case study for consideration during a workshop on sustainable development in the Circumpolar Arctic, as part of the World Conservation Strategy Conference in Ottawa. Three hundred and fifty international delegates are attending from all over the world. The case study is based on Old Crow and is being prepared in close consultation with the community.

It is intended to demonstrate the challenge and opportunities provided in attempting to ensure the sustainable use of renewable resources in the face of other types of non-renewable resource developments. As Minister, I have been invited by the conference organizers to chair the workshop, and I am delighted to be able to demonstrate the active role of the Yukon in conservation, to a

world-wide audience.

The Department of Renewable Resources has made a submission to the Royal Commission on Environment Development. I had the opportunity to give that submission to the commission in Edmonton last Saturday. The paper is entitled *New Approaches to Environment Management in the Yukon Territory*, and it profiles some of the new initiatives undertaken by the government during the last five years as well as describing several proposed programs.

The World Commission is a privately funded body with a mandate to report to the United Nations. They have toured Canada and I and other environmental Ministers met with them following the meeting in Edmonton this past weekend. It was an excellent meeting. The federal Minister of Environment was there as well as other provincial Ministers of Environment throughout Canada. The commission is now in Ottawa and will be wrapping up its North American tour shortly. It is going to be putting its report before the UN in 1987.

As the Assembly is aware, the Select Committee on Renewable Resources will be reporting in the fall session of the Legislature. The report will be a major factor in developing a strategic plan for renewable resources management. We are gradually collecting and analyzing other background materials relevant to the resource planning exercise. Resource planning techniques from across Canada are being examined to help design a strategic plan and our own considerable experience here in the Yukon will form the basic framework. Based on this work, we will be in a position to respond rapidly to the select committee report.

Background policy development work is underway with respect to water management to being the preparation for eventual program transfers from the federal government. This includes a number of special projects designed to slowly raise the profile of the Department of Renewable Resources in water issues. Included are: a response to the Federal Inquiry on Water Policy; participation in the development of CCREM water quality guidelines; participation in new placer mining review process; and, preparation of steps to implement the recommendations of the Yukon River Basin Study and attendance at selected Water Board hearings. Eventually a full water policy document will be drafted for public review and discussion. Because water is such a very basic resource, acceptable solutions to critical management issues will quite likely require considerable time to complete. By starting early, we will be better prepared for the eventual devolution discussions.

Background work is also being undertaken to ensure the successful implementation of the Northern Conservation Task Force recommendations, which this government has endorsed in principle. This includes collecting information on programs where the recommendations are already partially implemented, an inventory of available opportunities to implement the report, and work on the initial examination of potential protected areas.

"The Policy and Planning's Staff Branch, working with the Fish and Wildlife plans, Parks and Resources, Heritage Branch staff and also consulting with the Departments of Finance, Justice, Economic Development, Education, Community and Transportation Services will coordinate and support the involvement of the Yukon's members on the Inuvialuit Boards and Committees. They will also provide liaison between the Inuvialuit and the Inuvialuit Implementation Secretariat in DIAND.

At the present time, there are a number of environmental issues for which there is neither a clear federal mandate nor territorial legislation. Pesticide control is an example. It is the intention of this government to not only explore these issues, but to act on them.

To that end, my department has drafted pesticide legislation that is currently being reviewed and revised to better meet the needs of Yukoners.

As I have stated previously, the broader of environmental management is being addressed with the resource management transfer strategy being developed by the department. A policy framework to organize these transfers is currently under development and will be contained under the Strategic Plan for the department.

The Administrative Branch is composed of 13 positions and

provides administrative personnel and financial services to four other branches. The Deputy Minister's office is also included in this branch for budgetary purposes.

I would like to describe a number of this branch's activities in order to give the Members an understanding of this branch's responsibilities.

The Deputy Minister's office includes two person-years, the Deputy Minister and his secretary. As well as providing ongoing guidance and management to existing programs, my deputy is also deeply involved in a number of new initiatives including representing the department at a series of federal-provincial-territorial forest management conferences, in order to help pave the road for the transfer of forest management responsibilities to this government.

The budget for the Deputy Minister's office for 1986-87 is \$197,000. This includes cost of the Advisory Board, such as the Wildlife Advisory Committee, which has been established to advise me on various policy matters.

This part of the Administration Branch is under the direction of the Director of Administration. It has two major components: a financial unit and the personnel and administrative support unit.

The financial unit is comprised of three positions. It is responsible for coordinating the preparation of the department's budgets, payment of invoices, collection of revenues, preparation of financial reports and provision of financial advice to Land Managers.

This unit also coordinates the preparation and updating of the Capital Plan, as well as implementing any new procedures brought about as a result of the new Financial Management Information System.

The Personnel and Administrative Support Unit is comprised of six positions. This unit is responsible for all personnel actions, recruitment, maintenance of records, job evaluation and coordination of staff training, as well as provision of support services in purchasing assets and equipment control, expediting, maintenance of departmental records and library, the provision of computer programming and the operation, support and purchasing and supply of general office materials and equipment.

The Director of the branch is deeply involved in such areas as job evaluation, space allocation, the design and implementation of various information and word processing support services. One of the major thrusts that the Director will be responsible for will be overseeing a detailed information study. This is a study of informational needs and current options of the department, with a view to providing better and more precise information and providing it more efficiently. The budget for Administration Section is \$578,000.

⁴⁵ In summary, I would like to re-emphasize the remarks I first made on March 20 when introducing this budget to the House. I believe it is obvious from the comments I have just made and from the increasing numbers of new initiatives that our government is achieving outstanding progress toward the goals we set for ourselves. Yukoners who have either a direct or indirect interest in, or dependence on, our renewable resources are realizing that our goals are achievable and that we are capable of achieving them.

In addition to our general commitment to more responsive and efficient government, we have stated our intention to manage renewable resources to achieve: quality of life and environment, economic diversification and open and accountable government.

All of our policies and programs are being revised and updated to integrate these goals.

Our management responsibilities, as reflected in the estimates for the Fish and Wildlife, Lands, Parks and Resources, Agriculture, Policy and Planning, and Administration Branches, will include the development of a strategic plan for the future of the Yukon's renewable resources. Based on the input provided to the Select Committee and on the Committee's report to the Legislature, the strategic plan will be a guide to the future of the department. Elements of this plan will include an explicit set of goals and objectives, a redraft of the *Wildlife Act*, an improved level of community services and more local involvement in resource management. The strategic plan will also provide for the transfer of freshwater fisheries management responsibilities as well as forestry

responsibilities and eventually for the legislation needed to manage these resources. A park system plan and wilderness recreation strategy will be developed.

Projects on migratory birds habitat enhancement will continue and new habitat initiatives will be undertaken in cooperation with Habitat Canada. We will continue to work actively to counter the anti-trapping campaigns that are building in Europe and North America, and at home we will help to support and build the fur industry. A fur farming policy will be developed as a component of this work and to complement work with trappers on fur development and trapline management.

While we build and expand our existing wildlife, parks and resource management programs in the region, we will also continue to work at the national and international level to ensure a fair resolution to the Yukon River Salmon talks, to ensure that the Yukon's interests are represented and reflected in the administration of CITES and the migratory bird protocol, and to ensure that the international Porcupine caribou and Forty-Mile caribou herds are managed responsibly on both sides of the Alaska-Yukon border.

In building our improved management programs, the department will also build the advisory and consultative processes needed to ensure open and accountable government. In the 1986-87 fiscal year the department will provide support for a rebuilt and strengthened Wildlife Advisory Committee. It will continue to support the Agricultural Planning Advisory Committee, and establish the Porcupine Caribou Management Board and the North Slope Wildlife Management Advisory Council. Further consultations will take place with respect to the department's strategic plan, on resource harvesting and on renewable resource economic development, and we will do a better job of training our personnel in effective communication techniques and public participation processes.

This budget introduces some exciting and important new activities for the Department of Renewable Resources; activities that will support Yukon lifestyles and community aspirations; activities that will ensure sound management of our regional resources; and activities that will support the diversification and development of the Yukon economy.

The future of the Yukon's renewable resources will continue to be protected, enhanced and developed in the coming financial year.

⁴⁶ With that, I have covered a major part of the important areas of Renewable Resources Management in the Yukon. I hope that the information has provided the House with a clear understanding as to what its mandate is and what, specifically, we do in that area of government.

In addition to the comments regarding our budget, I would also like to update the Members. Earlier today, I mentioned that the count for Yukon-born wood bison was at four. I am happy to report that during my speech this afternoon, those numbers have increased to seven. We now have seven wood bison calves in the Yukon.

I look forward to specific debate on the areas of the department.

Mr. Brewster: I will not really say what I think, because the Chairman would probably throw me out of the House. That must be a record, and I have not been in the House for very long. There are 72 pages of answers to questions that started way back.

There is one here that I asked the Minister on April 21, and it took exactly one month according to the date, before it arrived here. This is only a start. In looking back through the questions, there are none dated and have been probably laying around, because no one put them where we could have a chance to look at them.

However, I guess if boys want to be boys and want to play around here, we can do that. There are still a number of questions here that were not answered. Everyone wants us to be speedy on this. Then, there is an example Yukon Game Farm — 300 elk, \$60,000. This is the type of thing that we are getting at. There is no way that there are 300 elk here for \$60,000.

I would suggest that maybe the government look at a few of these things. I am not a bit happy with what is going on. If this is the kind of cooperation I get, that is fine. I can play this game too. I have tried to be pretty decent about this, but if this is the way we are going to go, that is fine.

There are errors in the information. We get a 106-page document

that we are supposed to know to debate. It is an insult to this House that there is not one question that has been signed and dated. I guess we are playing games.

Before I go on to any other debate, a few of the other Members have a few things to say on this matter. Then, we will get on to general debate.

Hon. Mr. Porter: There is no one in the Department of Renewable Resources, nor on my staff, who is interested in playing games. We are interested in trying to manage the renewable resources of the Yukon to their most optimal benefit to the people of the Yukon. That is the intent of the department.

The Chairman and the Clerk's office will have noted that the original legislative returns tabled with the Legislative Assembly were signed and dated by myself. They were signed today.

The assertion that we were keeping information from the Member is not true. We are not interested in doing that. We have not been holding that information from the side opposite. My instructions to the department was to please go through all of the legislative documentation, *Hansard*, and bring forth for the O&M debates all of the questions that have been asked. They were told to make sure that by the time we got to the O&M Estimates we had all of the necessary answers.

That was a commitment that we gave to the Members opposite. They stated that if we would give more information on the programs, the initiatives on the departments, that that would be a catalyst to having a more expedient and a more knowledgeable debate.

It is within the spirit of those representations that the information today was tabled. It was not tabled for any kind of devious reasons that the Members may think exists. It is in that spirit that we have presented the budget, and hopefully all Members of this Legislature will conduct themselves in an equally important spirit.

Mr. Lang: I have heard all Members of the House give various reasons why certain things are done. I just want to refresh the Minister's memory. Perhaps his mannerism and his obvious disdain for the proceedings of this House takes priority.

On May 8, as the House Leader, I gave him a letter. I want to take the opportunity, since the Member took full range of the rules of the House, to read the letter.

Dated May 8, 1986, to Mr. David Porter:

"Dear Mr. Porter:

"Further to your request to extend the sitting hours of next week, our caucus has agreed to extend by two hours the evening sittings of next Monday and Wednesday. In order to expedite the budget, we would ask that all Ministers provide us with answers to the multitude of questions asked during the debate on the Supplementary Estimates as soon as possible."

That was on May 8, and we are dealing with questions that were asked in the middle of April. This is almost the end of May, and the Minister has the audacity to walk into this House and file with my colleague 72 pages of paper and expect him to study it while he is giving a speech that went on for two and one half hours.

I want to say to the Members opposite, "Put yourselves in our position, if we were on the other side and did that." You come to us wanting cooperation; that is fine; I do not have a problem with that, but when you come in here and do this — and, in fact, some of it is misinformed. I am going to ask a question and I want a yes or a no, not a bunch of political rhetoric. The dates are not on these Legislative Returns, and some of these questions were pertinent to other departments as well, not just the Minister's department. He just happened to have taken the lead role.

Two can play this game. If the Member from Whitehorse North Centre wants to talk, she should stand up and talk.

Even the Government Leader is embarrassed by the conduct here today. I can understand bringing in 10 answers, or whatever. We have sat in this House for a month and a half. We had conversations in our capacity as House Leaders that if he would bring in the answers well in advance it would help to expedite the discussions in the House. He brings in 72 pages, not eight by eleven, but 14 or 18 inches long. What is it, an inch thick? It is absolute arrogance. Absolute arrogance.

Mrs. Firth: I get somewhat distressed when I have to sit here

and listen to the Member for Watson Lake talk to me about conduct and the conduct of the Members when he has stood up on a point of order in Committee of the Whole and that we, effectively, had no right to ask questions in the Supplementary Estimates and take the length of time we were taking to ask questions, because the previous Opposition had only asked questions for two or three days.

I have listened, in this House, to the Minister of Renewable Resources continually say that he does not have the answers to questions. "I do not have that information at my fingertips; I will have to take that question under advisement; I will have to check back with the department and report back to the Member" time and time again for the many answers he did not have, information that he could have brought back to us a week later or a few days later; we were not asking for complicated things.

To have him stand up and say that, in the spirit of good debate and cooperation, he is now tabling 72 pages worth of Legislative Returns and answers, when he was asked, almost a month ago, to bring us the information so that we could have constructive debate; and to have him talk to us about conduct simply gives me the feeling that the Member had no intention of ever bringing the answers back.

He tells us that he just approved this package, that it was just signed. He was contemplating being out of the Legislature last week. I believe we had great concerns about how long we were going to be sitting. It makes me feel, as a Member, that the Minister of Renewable Resources had absolutely no intention of ever bringing back the information for us, so that we could go through it and see if our questions were being answered in order to proceed with some constructive debate.

As I am sure all the rest of the Members of this Legislature do, I object to that kind of behaviour. It is an attitudinal problem that is going to reflect, not only in this Legislature, but in the way that the Minister represents Yukoners. It only serves to bring embarrassment to the government and embarrassment to Yukoners.

I feel embarrassed, as a Member of this House, by the attitude and the behaviour of the Minister of Renewable Resources.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Again, the previous two speakers make the charges that the Department of Renewable Resources was, through my office, deliberately withholding information from them. The members of the department are here. They will very clearly verify the fact that I did not receive the information from them until last week with respect to the Members' questions.

This is not an area that I anticipated to be of a major concern. I did not anticipate that these questions would occupy so much time in the Legislature. It obviously has. Because of this debate, in the future, questions that are asked by Members in the Opposition will be answered as soon as possible. They will be given to Members opposite as soon as my office receives them. That is going to be the policy by which the department will be conducting itself in the future.

Hopefully, we will speed up the flow of information. The Members should appreciate that there are certain responsibilities that the department has on an ongoing daily basis in terms of management that interfere with doing business with the Legislature. I know Members of the Legislature feel that everything in government should grind down to neutral and all the wishes and questions of the Legislature be answered immediately.

Sometimes it does not happen. Sometimes there is a lag time from the time the questions are asked and the responses given. In this case, the Members opposite clearly take the point of view that the ensuing time between when the questions were asked and when the responses were given was totally unacceptable. I can understand that.

I can assure the Members opposite that, in the future when they do ask questions, we will speed up the process to get the information to them as soon as is humanly possible.

I might add that a lot of this has come about because this has been a really long session. The departmental people and ourselves have been in here going into our third month, so there has been an awful lot of stress and strain on the government and its personnel to keep up with a lot of the information and still be able to conduct the ordinary business of the House. Given those statements, we will

undertake in the future to try to speed up the process of the information exchange.

Mr. Brewster: I would like to remind the Minister of a little statement made by Harry S. Truman: "The buck stops here". I am a little sick and tired of every time we go after the Minister or talk to him and question what he is doing, he immediately brings the department in and tries to throw the department personnel against us. He is the man who we ask the questions of. He is the man who went out of here with the questions that he could not answer, and he is the man who should bring them back. Let us not try and throw the department against us all the time. It is the man who is the Minister who is running that department and that is where the buck stops and that is where he had better be prepared to look after it.

To start out, let us go back to deal with a few questions that were not answered. This one is one May 13, when Mr. Porter said that we will check the number of elk that exist in the wild and also those in the Hutchi area and will determine why the herd is having trouble reproducing.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The numbers, with respect to what the Member was asking, are not within my notes or the deputy's notes. The deputy informs me that that information is being compiled and at 7:30 tonight after we break I will bring that information.

Mr. Brewster: On April 17, the Minister advised us that he would be making an investigation to find out what the department had to say about the traplines that were not being used and that he would get back to us.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The real problem, as I discovered — and I did not really appreciate this when I was being asked questions in the House — was that when we looked at the history, section 68 of the *Wildlife Act*, it was changed by the previous government and section 68 of the old *Wildlife Act* gave the Director of Game the ability to remove traplines if they were not being used. The previous government changed the sections of the *Wildlife Act* that affected that for reasons I do not know.

Clearly, what has happened now is that they have made it almost impossible for the Department of Renewable Resources to remove traplines. We have checked into it and what we have basically come down to is that there has to be put in place — and the lawyers on the side opposite can check this out in terms of the *Wildlife Act* — a compensation and review board, which the Minister would have to deal with in terms of decisions to remove traplines. Again, the compensation review board is called for in the *Wildlife Act* to be structured and has been given certain powers.

⁵⁰ That review board was never set up. It is our intention, in terms of dealing with trapline-related issues, to first set in place the Compensation Review Board as called for by the *Wildlife Act*. Then, when we have bona fide cases where people are not trapping traplines for other than acceptable reasons, then we will begin a process of going to the compensation review board and asking that they consider the question of reviewing the traplines. In terms of the numbers, my information is that the numbers for this trapline season are not yet available.

Mr. Brewster: On April 22, "... re Hunting Survey, we will provide information of the cost related to the survey in Old Crow and also for all the Yukon." That is the hunting surveys.

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the question of the hunting surveys, if he is talking about the Hunters' Questionnaires that we do, we have some problems with that particular question in terms of the gifts. In the past — and this has been going on for year — we were giving out certain gifts, if you will — hunting knives and gift certificates from various operators in the Yukon — to individuals as an incentive for them to fill out these hunting questionnaires. In that way, it was designed to get information from them. We would then have a draw at the end of the season and give out the gifts.

We were informed by the Department of Justice recently that that particular program is illegal as we were conducting it, and that we can no longer proceed with it. I have instructed the department not to proceed with it.

Another problem that we had in the tabulation of Hunter Questionnaires is specific answers to questions that we had received in the past were always a year behind in terms of compilation of the data. For last year's results, my general comments would be that we

are just now in the process of tabulating those results.

⁵¹ **Mr. Brewster:** Will the Minister determine who has the signing authority for archaeological permits?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Was this question brought up in the Tourism debates? If it was related to archaeological permits, my information is that the Director of Heritage has that authority.

Mr. Brewster: I would like to start general debate now on the grizzly bear in zones 7 and 9. There are a number of questions that I would like to ask.

What is the study going to cost this year? What is it going to accomplish this year? As I recall, when it started out last year, because we prevented the grizzly bear from being hauled around, there was a full year to make a study.

Now we are doing another study. How often are we going to study these animals? How long are the batteries lasting in these collars? It is my understanding that they are dead after two years. That means that if the study does not proceed this year, then it is completely washed up, because the bears and the moose that have been collared during the first year will not have a radio signal.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member's information is correct. The life span of the collars that are being used is three years. Part of this year's program will be in removing the collars that were put on the bear cubs so that they, in no way, cause any potential harm to the animals.

The amount of the study is being researched by the Deputy Minister right now. As I recall the numbers, they were somewhere in the area of \$106,000. The purpose of the expenditure this year would be to continue to monitor the interaction between moose and grizzlies.

⁵² That is a major component of the program: to see what are the rates of predation on the moose species by grizzly bear in those particular areas, and it is very accurate with the collars because as soon as a moose calf goes down we get a change in the signal and we are able to dispatch aircraft directly on site and very quickly confirm as to whether or not a kill has been made and be able to determine what kind of animal is responsible for that kill taking place. That aspect of the program is going to continue this summer. As well, we will continue monitoring grizzly bear numbers. We will also be monitoring the grizzly bear habitat in the area. Basically, what we did last summer is to get a better insight as to exactly what kind of grizzly bear population we were dealing with and how far they were ranging.

Chairman: The time now being 5:30, we will recess until 7:30.

Recess

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

Hon. Mr. Porter: In response to a question asked earlier in the debate about the amount for Game Zones 7 and 9 program, it is \$90,000.

The latest elk population estimates for Yukon elk were done in the late 1970's when money for surveys became available because of the pipeline proposal. At that time, 36 elk were counted from the Takhini River and the Hutshi Lake herds. Since all animals could not be detected by an aerial survey, it was estimated that both herds had about 40 to 50 elk each, for a possible Yukon total of 80 to 100.

There have been no recent accounts, but observations from hunters and visitors suggest the herds are stable or perhaps slowly building up. Also, in the late 1970's, with funding from pipeline sources, a health status report on the herd was done by Dr. Eric Broughton, of the Canadian Wildlife Service.

Eight elk were captured and inspected for various parasites and diseases, among them tuberculosis and brucellosis. The elk were in good shape and disease free. The reason why not many calves are raised is possibly due to predation of the calves at an early age.

The Member is correct on the information of the number of elk in the Yukon. There was a typo; there are 30 elk, not 300.

Mr. Brewster: I will use that information about elk a little later. I gather that this study may end. The studies done until now have indicated that 53 percent of the calves were killed by grizzly bear; one

percent were killed by human hunters.

The Member also seems to think that we need more studies. How much proof, at taxpayers' expense, do we need when we already have proof that 53 percent have been killed by grizzlies or those studies are of no value.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is correct. We know the reasons for the decline in the moose population. We have identified the predator and the amount of predation that goes on specifically, as he mentions, by grizzly bears. The question then becomes, in terms of policy, how do you correct the situation?

We saw a corrective action could be taken by squeezing the hunting in the area to a minimum two-week time period for bulls only. Another action that had been taken by the previous government was to try to liberalize grizzly hunting, in which they allowed for special permits to be issued to outfitters and to residents to take grizzlies in that area.

To date, we have not changed those permits. The regulatory changes that were brought in to create those special permits have not been changed. That is still the case. Individuals in the Yukon can go in there and take a bear a year. If they so choose, they can apply to us for special guiding permits to take non-resident Yukoners in there to be able to take the bears out.

The situation will eventually stabilize, but as to the immediate course of action, as to whether or not to go in and utilize government personnel to take the grizzlies out, I am not inclined to do that. I have not received any advice from the department to do that.

Mr. Brewster: On the last point about taking in his own department, I have no problem agreeing with that. One thing that I would suggest that probably has not been and maybe should have been done this year or next year is possibly allowing the outfitters to bait. I know this is kind of a sour word, but when you have a problem you have to do something. This is not the first place in the world that baiting has been used.

When Mr. Callison had that area he was taking on an average of six to seven grizzly bears a year. We had no problems. He was put out of there about 10 years ago, and we now have to get rid of 60 to 70 bears a year.

If you balance all these things, I am concerned that the government, rather than going with what biologists and the experts are saying, may want to go with public opinion. Unfortunately, public opinion, although it counts for a lot, sometimes is not too well educated. They do not come and give you the answer for the problem. They just say you are wrong, but they do not have any suggestions as to how to solve this.

The government has a problem. We have to protect these moose. If we do not do anything — and we are not doing anything for another year, apparently — we are going to be in a situation, very shortly, where the cow moose may not recover.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think that this happens in areas where you get these moose down to where they cannot increase again. You put the problems of killing into a two-week period, which I have no problem with. I think we all agree on that. They were only taking bull moose, and my understanding from this situation is that this does not in any way hurt the breeding because there are still enough bulls to handle the cows there. So, this does not solve the hunting problem at all.

You mentioned that you would like to move the pressure of hunting around. I agree with you; however, people in Dawson will say, "Oh, let them stay down there and mind their own business". You have a problem; I am not saying that you have not. However, I think that we have to face this problem head on. The problem is in this area, and this is where we must protect the cow moose to bring the moose back. Nothing has been said at any time here about putting subsistence hunting into a two-week period to also help bring the moose back. If you counter between the two, maybe you can bring this back and leave the bear, but something has to be done.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Member. One other thing that would really assist in the efforts of the department is for people to go into those zones who have an inclination to hunt grizzlies. One of our problems is that there are very few residents going in there to hunt grizzly bears. Most often,

grizzly bears are taken by residents as a part of another hunt in which they simply pick up the tag and they are moose hunting, drifting on the river, and they chance on a grizzly; that is how most of the grizzlies are taken. I think it would do the situation a lot of good if those people who are interested in grizzlies do go in there and take those grizzlies. The information suggests that we are looking at a quite healthy population of grizzly bears.

The solution, as it stands right now, is that if we continue with the measures that we have now, and if we increase the local harvests, eventually we can stabilize the population by thinning the numbers of grizzlies. But, it is going to take a lot longer than a simple predator control program. That is the situation that we are looking at right now.

Mr. Brewster: I still think that the Minister should look at the outfitters. There are a number of things, one of which is that we bring money back into the Yukon. We are not going to be taking out 16 in a year. We can guarantee that. Maybe we do not have to take that many.

They must be notified in enough time to bring in hunts. The last time, they were notified two months ahead of time, and this does not work. They are bringing the trophy revenue. You are bringing people into the Yukon and putting people to work. It should also be helping the moose so we can have good control.

I agree with you that most residents will not go in because the area is very tough to get to, but outfitters would go in to do this.

How many grizzly bears and moose have been killed by over drugging or by the helicopter chase?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Three bears died as a result of the drugs administered to them. No moose were killed as a result of a drug overdose.

Mr. Brewster: I understand that if they are working in there this year, which I understand they are not at present, they will again be drugging the moose to take the collars off. How many are going to be killed this way? How much of this can they stand?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We really do not know that. We did tell the Member earlier that what we intend to do is to go in and take the collars off the cubs that were collared last year.

Because we have been in there for quite some time, the personnel who are involved in the program have a much better idea about how to use drugs. That experience will lend itself to a situation where we will have fewer fatalities than in the past.

Mr. Brewster: That is probably a correct statement. However, when things like this are done, accidents do happen. For instance, I recall one that was apparently shot through the heart or the lungs and killed that way.

The thing that bothers me is that we are spending this money, this year in the amount of \$90,000. Now we are going to take the collars off. If we decide to go with this study, we are going to spend another \$90,000 next year to put collars back on. Where does this end for taxpayers? We were so close to having a study finished, why was it not finished?

It looks like two to three years of studying the animals. Why was this not at least 20 percent completed with an effort to move some of the bears to find out what is going on? Now, the collars are going to be taken off. The Select Committee decided that they were right, and that the biologists are right to move the bears. How many times can you administer drugs to the bears without causing a chain reaction?

We had two examples of bear attacks last year. I am not convinced that these bears do not react to human smell when they attacked those people, but they are not sure of that. They have the evidence, but they do not think it is enough.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I cannot offer a definitive statement on that. There are many things about animals and their habits that we do not know about. No amount of university time and time in the laboratories is going to give you that information. That information comes from being out in the field and living in the same habitat as bears and viewing them on a day-by-day basis to get a deeper understanding of how they will react in a given situation.

With respect to the information as to how many times they can be drugged, apparently in the northern Yukon where we were conducting some studies in the past, individual bears have been

drugged up to eight times without any negative reaction physically to themselves. In terms of the question that the Member raises about whether or not we are building up animosity toward human beings by this continued harassment, as it is looked on by some, that I cannot answer.

Mr. Brewster: Number one, anybody that has followed this cannot deny there are stories that when helicopters are going over these bears they immediately kick over on their back and start clawing with their feet. I have been told about bears that have attacked helicopters. I know, personally, of an instance where two bears attacked a drill. When I questioned this, it turned out the helicopters had been chasing those bears down that valley for over a month. Every morning they would catch those bears in that valley and run them up over the hills. I do not blame the bear for working over the first noisy thing he got on the ground.

Here we are almost to the point where we can prove this and stop all this taxpayers' money every year going on study after study. Now it appears we are going to scrap this and start all over. It really bothers me.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are not starting the study over. We have cut out the wolf removal aspect of the program and have not proceeded with a bear removal program. We will be continuing on with the monitoring aspect of the study to monitor the activities of the animals within the area.

Mr. Phillips: Can the Minister tell me how many bears are collared in zone 7 right now?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It seems that we do not have that specific information. We will obtain that and bring it out to the Member's attention.

Mr. Phillips: I understand it was quite significant, 30 or 40 bears. Is that a rough figure? Is it close?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The number sounds too high.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister stated earlier that he would like hunters to go in and possibly remove some of these bears. One of the concerns I have is that, first of all, he has restricted the hunting season in the area for almost everything except bears — down to a very short two-week season — so there is really not much incentive for people to go in there for moose. There are very few moose in there.

He has collars on most of the bears in the area. He knows himself that if someone goes in there, bear meat is edible, but a lot of people will go in in the spring for the hide. If the bear has a collar on it, it certainly does a lot of damage to the hide. Is there not a rule or a regulation that says you cannot shoot collared animals? It sort of wipes out the whole idea.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If an individual takes a collared animal, it is their responsibility to report the incident and return the collar to the department. I do not believe there is anything in the legislation that will cause the individual to be charged for shooting an animal.

Mr. Phillips: Maybe the law has changed, but I understood that any animal that was radio-collared was protected because the government was spending money on that animal.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Apparently in the past, that had been the case. It was a regulation, but we had situations where people were shooting the animals and not reporting that the animal was shot; therefore, we lost information on the animal when we lost the radio-collars. Apparently, those regulations were no longer enforced. We are now finding that people, without the fear of being charged, are bringing the collars forward.

Mr. Phillips: Has the Wildlife Branch advertised this? Can the Minister tell me how many resident hunters traditionally took moose out of zones 7 and 9 in the past before the restrictions?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Thirty percent of the moosing hunting pressure of the entire Yukon was in that particular area.

Mr. Phillips: Does the Minister not think that that is significant enough in itself. It is close to the area and a lot of residents like to go out and get their moose fairly close to home so that it is not that expensive. To cut down on Whitehorse people going to Mayo or Dawson to hunt their moose and intruding on the hunting area of those local residents, and with 30 percent of Yukon hunters hunting their moose in zones 7 and 9, does the Minister not feel that there should be more management of moose hunting in those areas?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Clearly, the objective is to have the moose population built up to such a level that they can sustain a controllable harvest in the future. That is the goal of the program in zones 7 and 9.

With respect to the diversion of the hunting pressure to other areas of the Yukon, clearly, in many communities, there is a prejudice to individuals who come and hunt in their specific areas. From experience, most of the hunting takes place around communities. Many parts of the Yukon are not hunted at all. For example, if you have ever been on the South Canol Road in hunting season, there is incredible truck traffic. One weekend when I was there, 148 vehicles came through a check stop. Most of the hunting is contained within the highway corridors, within road accesses that are opened up by mining industries and other developers that are out in the bush.

Basically, many people do not have the skills or the interest to go out and hunt in the remote areas of the Yukon. Where they can get their 4X4s and unload their ATVs, in many instances, that is where the hunting occurs, although the advent of ATVs is making it almost impossible to keep people out of remote areas. If you have been out in the bush a lot, you will be in the middle of nowhere and an ATV will come around the mountain. With increased technology there is access into areas that have not been hunted before. We have a responsibility to try to disperse the pressure to other areas of the Yukon. That is a point we will stress with the hunting community until such a time we can build up the numbers in 7 and 9 so that the species there can sustain harvesting.

Mr. Phillips: I agree with the Minister that we have to build the numbers up. I think some of the points the Minister made actually reinforce my point. The people in Mayo, who like to hunt in Mayo, do not want to drive to Whitehorse to hunt and vice versa. The people in Whitehorse do not want to drive to Mayo to hunt. It is not worthwhile if you have to drive 600 to 800 miles.

I am sure the hunting pressure will be disbursed by some people who would like to go to the quieter areas, and they will take their ATV's, their horses, or fly in and hunt in these areas. We should be managing the areas like Alligator Lake, the Wheaton River Valley where locals can go, where senior citizens do not have to walk five or ten miles, where parents who want to take their children can camp close without having to hike another 20 miles.

The Minister cut back in the Wolf Control Program in zones 7 and 9. The wolves were taking roughly 10 percent of the adult moose population. He could not do anything about the bears, because there it was such a controversial program. If he wants to build up the moose population, he could at least continue with the Wolf Control Program to have some of these cows survive.

If the wolves are attacking the adult moose cows, and some of these data prove that a lot of these cows were 9 to 11 years old, we are going to get to a critical point in the very near future where we are not going to have as many calves as we have now, because we have no recruitment from the bottom up.

Has the Minister considered that, and is he prepared to reinstate the wolf control program in zones 7 and 9?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The government has clearly stated its position on this study area and the policy related to it. We have made a statement that we are going to await the findings of the Select Committee, and we will then issue a comprehensive program with respect to predator control policy for the Yukon. It will probably not be until fall when that decision can be discussed.

Mr. Phillips: Why did the Minister continue with the Finlayson Lake Herd Predator Control Program then? We are looking at the same thing, at a declining herd that needed some work. In that case, the predators were wolves, principally. In this case, it was wolves and bears.

I was at the same meeting as the Minister at the Selkirk Street Ancillary Room. There was a clear message from the parties at that table that they thought the Predator Control Program for wolves should continue.

It was the bear Predator Control Program that everyone was concerned about. They thought the Minister had to find an answer to that. Why did he not take the advice and continue the Wolf Control Program in zone 7?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The situation at Finlayson is very different from the situation in zones 7 and 9. In Finlayson, we have one prey species and one predator species. The program was very clear. The community and the people in the area had a unanimous opinion with respect to that program.

In the southern Yukon, the situation is entirely different. We have the major predator being the grizzly bears. They accounted for a vast proportion of the predation on the moose species. If we cannot tackle the question of grizzly bears, if we cannot make a decision to make grizzlies out, then we will have a difficult time justifying, not only to the public but to myself, to just simply discriminate against the wolf species to take them out for the 10 percent they do.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister seems to think that taking wolves out of the Finlayson area is acceptable, but taking wolves out of Game Zone 7 is not. I would suggest that the Minister should do everything in his power. He certainly has not hesitated to put restrictions on the non-native hunting of moose in Game Zone 7, and nobody has complained. As a matter of fact, I know the Fish and Game Association recommended restrictions, but we also think that the government should take some action to try to turn this around. If the Minister is going to take some action, what is he planning to do with the bears in Game Zone 7? Is he planning on extending the season? Is he planning on allowing baiting? What is he planning to do to turn around the problem that he says he has to turn around?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The policies that we have in place do not offer a quick-fix solution. It is a gradual build-up of the population, if we continue with the present policies as they are enunciated. Clearly those policies are a restriction of the ability of humans to harvest the animals. As I have stated earlier, we have cut the hunting down to a situation where no cow moose can be taken anywhere in the Yukon, specifically in those areas that we are discussing. There is a limited season, two weeks, for bulls only. It is pre-rut that this hunt is allowed. Therefore, the success rate of the hunters will be diminished.

There are regulations in place that allow for outfitters to go in and to take guided hunts in the area with special permits. There is a relaxation of the regulations that have the effect of allowing resident Yukoners to go in and take a bear each year if they so choose. There are also regulations in place that will allow permits to be issued to resident Yukon hunters who may want to guide non-resident hunters. That is the extent of the program as it relates to Game Zones 7 and 9 regarding the issue of bears.

Mr. Phillips: What is the average age of a cow moose in the area right now?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We do not have a definitive average age at our fingertips, but, as the Member alluded to in his statements about the moose being 9 or ten or eleven years old, clearly from the data that has been gathered the situation is that we are dealing with a mature population.

Mr. Phillips: At what age do the cows stop giving birth to calves? What I am trying to determine, and I think the Minister should understand this, is that I think we are reaching a very critical point in that area if we do not do something. We cannot afford to go real slow. We have to take some action in the area. Can the Minister tell me at what point has his biologist said that they think we will be on a real slide, when we will not get our 96 percent, or whatever we are arriving at, with their pregnancy, and it may go down to 65 or 70 percent with no recruitment of younger cows in the herd?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Both the deputy and myself are not aware of any such prediction having been made by the biologist.

Mr. Coles: I would just like to go back for one second and check on something the Member for Riverdale North said about baiting. Has the department considered at all allowing outfitters into the area to bait bears?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, we have not. As a matter of fact, I just met last week with the Wildlife Advisory Committee and that was not discussed at all.

Mr. Coles: It seems like that may be a fairly sensible solution. I would like to know why it was not discussed?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is the position that the Member holds. I

do not personally support it. I have not been given any representation by the department officials that we should pursue baiting. It has not been represented as a position of the Wildlife Advisory Committee.

In terms of that as being the answer, I have not been given any indication that people are in favour of it. The outfitters have not written to me or expressed this position to me in the two meetings that I have held with them.

Mr. Phillips: Since the Minister has discontinued the zone 7 and 9 predator control, was that a recommendation of his biologists, or was that a political decision?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the discontinuation of the program in 7 and 9, that was a decision made by Cabinet.

Mr. Phillips: What was the recommendation from the department? The Minister must have gone to Cabinet with a recommendation from the department that said they could stop it now and there would not be any problem, or they said that they had to continue it to get the needed data.

Hon. Mr. Porter: There was a range of recommendations that the department had put together for Cabinet's consideration.

Mr. Phillips: The suggestions coming from this side of the floor here today, from the Member for Kluane and the Member for Tatchun, about bear baiting has been accepted in a great many provinces in Canada, when they have problems. In some areas it has been in place for a long time.

Can the Minister tell us if that was one of the recommendations made by his biologists? Is the Minister considering that? If that was not the recommendation, what were some of the recommendations made by the biologists?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the question of confidentiality of Cabinet decisions, I am informed that that is a very distinct principle of government as we know it. For that reason, I would not disclose information as to what was contained in the Cabinet submission that was brought forward by the Department of Renewable Resources.

At this point, we will have to agree to disagree on this issue. The Member has a position. We have a position. I have a position. The government has not decided to move on that point. It is there for the public to judge. The Member representing the party opposite is in favour of this measure, and I have stated that we are not in favour of it.

With respect to an earlier question on collared bears in 7 and 9, the information that we have received is that there are approximately 20 bears wearing collars. This is equally distributed between males and females.

Mr. Coles: Am I right in saying that 53 percent of the moose killed in 7 and 9 are killed by grizzly bears? Is that the figure?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Roughly we are talking about that percentage. Very specific information on the predation rates, tables, graphs and numbers were distributed to the public. If the Member wants, we can make that available to him. The figure is around that number.

Mr. Coles: Does the Minister know what the predation rate from wolves was with the Ross River caribou herd before they started the predator control there?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We do not have those study documents here, but I can tell the Member that the predation rates on the calves are very significant in Finlayson. They have come up remarkably since we have taken the program.

Mr. Coles: Can the Minister guess? Was it close to 53 percent? Is it about the same rate? Was it more? Was it less?

Hon. Mr. Porter: At the beginning of the program, we were looking at a calf/cow ratio of 11 to 100, so we had a situation where, during the course of a year, only 11 calves were surviving to 100 cows.

Mr. Coles: I do not understand why it is harder to decide to kill a wolf than it is to kill a bear. That is beyond me. I can understand the political ramifications. To me, it is just as serious to go out and shoot a wolf as it is to go out and shoot a bear. If they are both causing the same problem, I do not understand what the problem is in making a decision.

Hon. Mr. Porter: As the Member is probably aware, we are

getting letters on a daily basis for the program that we have now. This is not simply a question of biology. This is an issue of public policy. This is an issue that permeates a number of questions. If the Member is in the position that he is in favour of taking grizzlies using government personnel and equipment, that is his position. I differ.

Mr. Coles: This government is spending I do not know how much money, fighting Greenpeace and all these organizations that are against trapping. Now he is doing a flipflop saying that he is going to go out there and protect these bears. There is no continuity. I do not understand at all. People over there are screaming at this government right now, because they do not think we should be trapping. You are standing up here telling us we should be trapping. It is those same people who do not want you out there killing the bears and you are agreeing with them. I do not understand that.

Mr. Brewster: I thought I had closed this off, but I guess I had not. I am gathering, from the Minister's remarks, an animal is dead, whether a wolf kills it or whether a bear kills it.

"You take the Finlayson caribou herd and you reduced the wolves enough to bring back your herd fantastically. Then you turn around and because it is a bear and not a wolf, the moose is dead. Let us face it, come on, it is dead.

This government is playing around with politics. He has as much as admitted it, and I have seen statements in the paper because people are going to write him. Tough banana. I got people writing me and they are bawling the hell out of me because I said Dallas should get out and the Stanley Cup hockey game should be played, but you got to face those facts. He is not using biological things. He made the statement very plain that the Cabinet made the decision. I would like to see those confidential reports that they will not show me of what the biologists say. How can a biologist, when he has proved 53 percent of the animals being killed by a bear, turn around and say "well, don't do that, let the bears live"? Let us face some facts around here. Sometimes you gotta bite the bullet, and it is about time they bite the bullet on this thing.

You cannot keep on going around and hiding because some old lady down in Ontario or in New York is going to write a protesting letter in. There is lots of letter written about the trapping, but we stood on that one, did we not? Well, we are not going to stand on this one. They are going to pass it back, Mr. Chairman, to you and me on the Select Committee. If we can come up with a petition, like we did when we went to Ross River, all of a sudden a petition showed up, bingo, those wolves are dead. It was good game management. Let us look and just follow this game management a little bit. They brought the caribou up. I think there is around 4,000 springing up, close to 5,000. Three now, and then it will be four maybe in a year, year-and-a-half. We brought this back through this good game management.

Now, as you get this up to where the habitat can stand no more, then this is fine. Then you will let the wolves come back in. If you are trying to manage an animal that is becoming extinct, we have increased this by thousands, so this is good game management and the wolves are going to come back, and the bears are not going to come back as fast, but you are not going to take that many bears out. You are going to control what you do. You are going to have to quit this taking things like this to the Cabinet, who, I will bet you, have never read the books that I have read, put out by this Department of Renewable Resources, which state time after time after time that this is what is happening. But, they made a political decision because they are scared to stand and bite the bullet.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Yukon has more than simply a responsibility to its citizens on this particular issue. Clearly, if the Members were to sit and listen for awhile, they would be told that the Yukon has 30 percent of the world's population of grizzly bears. The biological facts are clearly that the reproductive rates between grizzlies and wolves are entirely different. Those are the facts that relate to this question. We have made our decision on this particular question, and we will live with that decision.

Mr. Lang: I am getting tired of the person from New York or the person from Toronto who is busy writing the Minister a letter, who is a member of the Greenpeace dictating the game policy for

this government, which happens to be our responsibility. Right now, what you are doing, what the MLA for Klucane is telling you, it is not good management. It is not good game management what is happening. What I do not understand is beyond me. Why are caribou in the Finlayson Valley more important alive than a moose alive in Game Zone 7 and 9?

¹² Is it because we do not have a band resolution here locally? We have not got a petition out of Porter Creek? Is that the problem?

It is time he grew up and started taking his responsibilities on. Did the Department of Renewable Resources — the professionals, the experts whom we paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for — recommend to him to discontinue that program? Yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am clearly on record as saying, after consultation with the Government Leader, that decisions that are reached by Cabinet and documents brought before Cabinet are not to be discussed.

Mr. Lang: Were there any options or alternatives put forward to the Wildlife Advisory Committee this past week for the purposes of putting some solutions forward to meeting the problem in game zones 7 and 9?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the meeting with the Wildlife Advisory Committee, there was no discussion of that nature.

Mr. Lang: I take it that it is not important enough. It was not even put on the agenda by the government in order to find out what solutions could be found to meet also the government's aspirations, as well as management aspirations. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I missed the tail-end of his statement, but with respect to the question of discussions with the Wildlife Advisory Committee on this issue, at my first meeting with the Committee this issue was discussed. They supported the government's position to continue with the Finlayson program.

Mr. Lang: Is it the intention of the government to do away with the biologists, in view of the fact that obviously these studies are not worth much, so what are we paying all this money for? What is the intention of the government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would not respond to that question. The Member clearly knows the answer.

Mr. Coles: I do not think anybody in the House wants to be known as blood-thirsty grizzly killers, or anything like that. It is just that it is an idea that I think is worth looking at. I think even some biologists may think that it is worth looking at. We know the bears reproduce slower than wolves, so you do not have to kill as many. Cut down the population gradually. Let the moose come back gradually. Use some common sense in the bloody department.

All we are asking is that he take a look at it. Nobody here is insisting on anything. Let the biologists look at it. Let them do another study, if they have to, if it is going to bring the moose back. Let them take a look at it and then come back and tell us.

Hon. Mr. Porter: This issue has been looked at. Biologists in the department and personnel in the department have made their recommendations. The government has taken a position on this issue. I suspect that this issue will be around as long as we continue to have wild game in the Yukon.

Mr. Coles: Why can the Minister not tell us what the biologists recommend? They are not part of the Cabinet. We do not want to know what the Cabinet dealt with or how they arrived at the decision. What did the biologists recommend to the Cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The biologists do not recommend directly to Cabinet. What happens is the biologists have their input to the director of the branch. The branch director then makes the deputy minister aware of the position, and then the deputy minister prepares, in consultation with me, a Cabinet submission outlining the various alternatives. That document is then delivered to Cabinet.

¹³ **Mr. Coles:** Perhaps the Minister could tell us what the biologist told the Director, who told the Deputy Minister, who told the Minister what he took to Cabinet. What did the biologist tell the Director? What did the Director tell the Deputy Minister? What did the Deputy Minister tell the Minister? What were the recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Porter: One of the recommendations that came from the biological staff was to continue the program to remove bears.

As well, a second recommendation was to hold the program until the Select Committee has had the opportunity to review the question. The third recommendation was to stop the program altogether and reallocate the dollars.

Mr. Phelps: The Minister seems to have already disclosed that it was not, in Cabinet's view or in his own, an issue of public policy. We know that there were various options given to the Minister and the Cabinet. That is the nature of a Cabinet document.

I am suggesting to him and to this House, and I ask him to deny it if I am wrong, that the preferred option was not the one chosen by Cabinet; it was to continue with the program in zones 7 and 9. Is that not correct? If not, the Minister can deny it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: As a correction to the record, the Member stated that we were making decisions strictly on a public policy basis. I said, if you will check *Hansard* again, this is not only a biological decision, it is also a public policy decision.

It is not only a question of biology. The biology of the issue is a factor, but, as well, it is an issue that has to be considered in light of public policy.

I do not know if there was a preference within the department of biology, I do not know the view that the biologists held on this question.

Mr. Phillips: I found it very interesting that the Minister had all these facts in his mind about 30 percent of the world's grizzlies are in the Yukon, yet, when I asked him for facts pertaining to the study in zones 7 and 9, he did not have any idea.

Is the Minister listening to the people outside who are absolutely uninformed of the types of letter we see in the papers that are written by a Greenpeace oriented group? Is the Minister listening to this group versus the 30 percent of the Yukon hunters who hunt in zones 7 and 9? Is he telling those hunters that we are not going to do anything about the grizzly bears in that area or about protecting the moose? Is he telling those hunters, those 1,000 to 1,500 hunters, to hunt in the area of Carmacks, Mayo or Ross River? Is he saying that he is not interested in managing wildlife for the residents of the Yukon in zones 7 and 9?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Clearly, that is not what I am saying. If the Member takes himself back a few minutes, he will recall that I clearly articulated what management initiatives we were taking in 7 and 9.

In terms of the Member stating that it is outsiders who are dictating to us about the question of game management, I had a meeting with the panel we put together to undertake the public meeting the next day. I went around the table to the Fish and Game representatives, CYI representatives, representatives of the Outfitters Association and I asked every one of them if they would endorse the government removing grizzlies. Everyone of them said no. That is the people of the Yukon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Phillips: I was at the meeting of the Fish and Game Association and I know what their position is. Their position is, yes, we have to remove grizzlies. They just think that it is a rather sensitive issue and the Minister has to explore ways of doing it. They also suggested to the Minister that it is extremely urgent. Does the Minister think that the problem we have in zones 7 and 9 is urgent? Is it something that we should deal with this year? Can we postpone it for a year or two? How many years have the biologists told them that we have until we run into a critical situation in zones 7 and 9?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are dealing with the issue in 7 and 9. It is of concern to us. The Member is quite bright; I do not have to go back over and tell him what we are doing. I told him that we are continuing with the regulations; we are limiting the hunting of moose in the area, and those activities are taking place in that area.

The information I have received on the Finlayson herd is that the adult death rate dropped from 28 percent to 11 percent over four years. That is in addition to questions that were asked earlier.

Mr. Coles: Does the Minister know what percentage of the world's wolf population is in the territory?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No. I do not know that. The reason why the question of 30 percent of the world's population of grizzlies was so clearly to the forefront of my consciousness is that that information was contained in the statement we made to the Royal Commission

on the Environment.

Mr. Coles: I wonder if the Minister could tell me what is so morally and publicly right about killing wolves and wrong with killing grizzlies? I just do not understand the difference.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Aside from the public ramifications of the decision, as I stated earlier, the reproductive rates of the two species are vastly different. It has been suggested by wolf biologists that when the wolves are being hunted and their numbers decrease, they increase the number of the litter to try to compensate for the reduction in numbers. That does not happen with grizzly bears, and it is a much more sensitive area. The biology in dealing with grizzlies is much more fragile than in dealing with wolves.

Mr. Coles: It would seem obvious to me that you do not kill as many bears. He is saying that it is right to kill a wolf, and it is wrong to kill a bear. They are both creating the same problem. Do not kill as many bears; just kill a few — take 10. Take whatever it takes to give the moose a start back up. Do not wipe the grizzlies out of the area so that we have a big moose herd. What does the Minister see morally wrong with shooting a bear that is right about shooting a wolf?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member can drive this for all it is worth, but I have clearly stated the position to him that this government has stated that we are not going to use government personnel or resources to remove bears. That is the position we have taken. If the Member is really concerned and serious about it and wants to assist the program, he can take a grizzly as well in that particular area to help alleviate the problem. That is an option that is open to the people of Yukon. If the outfitters, the resident hunters, if all of these people out there would exercise the leeway that we have given them in the regulations, I am sure that within a couple of successful seasons, the numbers would be thinned.

Mr. Coles: I do not care for bear meat, myself, and there are not many up here who do that I know of. They are interested in getting some moose meat on the table. There are people who would pay big money to come into this territory, hunt those bears, get rid of the problem for the Minister and add some money to the economy, so what is the problem?

The outfitters are telling us that in game zones 7 and 9, it is too hard to go in and track the bears and hunt them. Why will the department not consider letting them bait just in those two areas for a year or two to clear up the problem. They could take as many bears as the biologists think is necessary to allow the moose population to come back up?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is a question of ethics. The Member would like to see bear baiting done, and we have a disagreement on that particular question. I do not believe that it should be done. Both my father and my uncle outfitted. They never baited and they were successful. It is not a method that I agree with.

Mr. Phillips: The moose hunter in the Yukon is in trouble. The Minister has said that if it is a grizzly bear problem he is going to do nothing about it. The next time it may be Carmacks, or might be Mayo, or might be Ross River, but if it happens to be bears, and grizzlies in particular, the Minister is going to do nothing about it. You are just going to have to live with the 20 or 30 year cycle. That is unacceptable to me. The Minister seems to be so damned worried about bears and the reproductive rate of bears, and is not worried about the reproductive rate of moose in the southern Yukon.

When does it become critical? When does it become critical in zones 7 and 9, that they act and do something to protect that moose population? When will they do something?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Once again, we are doing something about this particular issue. The previous government enacted regulations that called for the relaxation of the hunting regulations in zones 7 and 9. Those relaxations of the regulations are as follows:

Outfitters can be given special permits to go into 7 and 9 to take additional bears.

The resident hunters, as I recall from a discussion with the previous Minister, can guide non-residents in the area to take a bear. I think there were 100 permits. Resident hunters can go in every year and take a bear, if they choose. That is the situation, and those are the regulations.

In addition, all cow moose hunting in the Yukon has been banned

completely. That was a decision reached by the previous government. Further to that, we have put in place a decision that restricts the hunting of bulls to two weeks. That is what is being done.

Mr. Phelps: I want to make sure that we have the Minister's position correct with regard to the recommendations and options given him by the biologists in the department.

As I understand it, there are three. One was to carry on with the program. The second was to postpone it until the report was received from the Select Committee. The third was to stop it altogether. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Leader of the Official Opposition is correct. Those are the three positions that I am informed came from the biologist staff to the Director.

Mr. Phelps: I thank the Minister. I also take it that the biologists did not express any preference, from a biological point of view, on any of the three options? Is that exactly what the Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As the Member will recall in reading my answer, I stated that I was not aware of any preference that the biologists had toward any of those recommendations.

Mr. Phelps: Did the Minister at any time discuss these options and the issue of the carrying on or not carrying on or the postponing of the program with the biologists concerned?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I talked to the biologists about this. That was just after we took over as government, and that was at the Rose Lake Camp where the program was being run from. We talked about the whole issue, and basically it was a briefing session on their part as to what it was that they were doing. After that point, when we were considering a decision, I never had any discussions with them about this.

Mr. Phelps: Given your answers that those are the three options and the biologists had no preference at all, it would seem very clear that you were then able to make a choice without any reference to the biological study. The biologists gave you the three options, and they were of equal priority from a biologist's point of view, in whatever representations were made to you to them either in writing or verbally. Is that correct? They would not have a position among the three.

33Hon. Mr. Porter: There was a lot of information related to this study. The data that flowed from it was made available. There were personal discussions that I had in Rose Lake with the biologists about the program. I had public meetings, Advisory Committee meetings, meetings in Ross River, public meetings in Whitehorse. All of those factors would have had some bearing on the eventual decision that I went to Cabinet with.

17Mr. Phelps: A lot of money was spent on this program. He has gone through a couple of years of it. He has had discussions with biologists. They have given him three starkly different options. One was to carry on with this program for its final year. Another was to postpone it indefinitely, and the third was to stop it altogether. They really did not care. Between the three, it was all the same to them.

That is unusual, it seems to me, but that is his position. I find it a little unusual, but will accept it, of course.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If what the Member is getting at is did I sit down with the biologists and canvass them to see if they were for or against, or which is the recommendation? The department does not work like that. Many areas of government do not work in that fashion. The biologists report to the director. They make the director aware of what their position is. The director then brings the recommendations to the deputy minister. The deputy minister then represents those issues to the Minister and the Minister then deals with his Cabinet colleagues.

That is the chain of events that follows the decision-making process. As I have stated to the Member, I am not aware of any particular option that was favoured or not favoured by the biologists on this question.

Mr. Phelps: Given the starkly different options presented by the biologist, and there would seem to be absolutely no preference, was he not made aware of any preference whatsoever between the three options held by the biologists through his director?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No. I can see what the Member is attempting

to drive at. He is trying to put forward a situation where the biologists recommended one thing and that we simply ignored their recommendations and went against the department. As I state again, for the record, I was not aware of any particular favour or disfavour of the department's biological team with respect to those issues.

The end result is that the government had to make a decision, considering all of the factors. There is a multitude of them. We have gone through some of them. The end result is that it is up to the government to make a policy decision on the issue. That was done, given what had been available to us through the department.

With respect to information on an earlier question, I believe someone asked how many wolves were in the Yukon. Our approximation is 8,000 wolves in the Yukon. As to its relationship to the wolf population in the world, we do not have that data as to what the population base of wolves is in the world.

Mr. Phelps: I stand here rather amazed. Let us take two of the options. One is to carry on with the program in the final year, and the other is to stop it altogether forever. As far as the Minister is concerned, between those two starkly divergent options, the biologists, from a biologist's point of view, had no preference. He could have taken either one and it would not have mattered to them.

18 Hon. Mr. Porter: I think it would be counterproductive to try to guess and to speculate as to what their preferences were.

At the end of the day, we made a decision, and that decision was to await the finding of the Select Committee. Upon conclusion of the Select Committee Report, the government has undertaken to issue a comprehensive policy statement on the question of predator control in the Yukon.

Mr. Phelps: Your answer is yes then. As far as you are concerned, you have no idea that the biologists would have preferred any of the three options. That is exactly what you have been saying over and over again. I just want to make sure that I understand it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I can speculate as to what I think they thought, but that is not of relevance. The relevant fact is that in the end result Cabinet is the decision-making instrument of the government. They take into consideration all the relevant information that they deem necessary to make decisions.

Mr. Coles: Would I be right in saying that most biologists employed by the Minister's department are specialists?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of their employment within the department, they are assigned to responsibilities that can be construed as being of a specialized nature.

Mr. Coles: Can the Minister tell us what his bear biologist made as a recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I really do not know what the bear biologist said as opposed to the moose biologist as opposed to the wolf biologist. I do not know that detailed information. If I were to concern myself with details of that nature in every decision that we make in government, that would be a very cumbersome process indeed.

As I stated to the Member, the biologists report to the Director, the Director reports to the Deputy Minister, and the Deputy Minister deals with the Minister, and the Minister deals with Cabinet. That is the chain of decision-making.

Mr. Coles: I think we have control of how the decision-making process works. The Minister has just said that the Cabinet made a decision, yet he is telling me that he knows no facts pertaining to the decisions.

He does not know what the bear biologist said, or the ungulate biologist said, or the wolf biologist said. How does he make a decision of a technical nature like this without knowing any of the details?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member will go back to *Hansard*, he will see that I stated that there are a number of issues and information. If he is really interested, we can bring all the data down to him that has been put out to the public.

There is a lot of biological data that is available to get a sense of the biological questions that were raised on this issue. As to whether or not I can list individual biologist's personal views on this question, I never did that, and I do not intend to make it a practice regarding how I make decisions in the future.

19 Mr. Coles: Now the Minister is telling me that the public at large knows more about making this decision than he does. I have seen that information. I am wondering why the Minister has not seen it. How did he base his decision? He did not listen to the biologists, because he just finished telling me that he did not even know what they are thinking.

I would like to see the Cabinet submission. Too bad we cannot, because it must be a blank piece of paper.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The misunderstanding of the debate is contagious. The Member now is accusing me of not reading the information that was put out by the department and not knowing about it. That information came across my desk before it was released for public consumption. I have read the information.

I am not going to canvass individual biologists; that is not how the decision was made. The biologists had their input. I hope he understands this. They made their recommendations to the Director of Fish and Wildlife. We have detailed for him what those recommendations were. There were three. Those were moved up the line, and we then dealt with the issue and made a decision.

Mr. Coles: I am not accusing the Minister of anything, and I hope he did read the information before he passed it on to the public. I just want to know how he arrived at the decision. I still want an answer to the question I asked. This is the fourth time I have asked it. What is publicly and morally acceptable about killing wolves that is not acceptable about killing bears? Why is it easier to go out and kill a wolf than it is to kill a bear, and why is it more acceptable?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I have stated on two occasions, the two species are very different. The ability to reproduce is biologically different between the two animals. Wolf biologists have done a lot of work in that area. If the wolf population is being hit hard they counter by increasing their reproductive rate. They put out more wolves to compensate for the loss of numbers.

With the grizzly bears, the situation is entirely different. We have a very fragile situation. With some wrong decisions, we could do some real damage to the grizzly population.

Mr. Coles: I am trying to understand the situation, but I do not. Does it not make sense to the Minister that you kill fewer bears if they do not reproduce as fast. If the wolves reproduce too fast, you kill more wolves. Does that not make sense to the Minister? That is just a commonsense question.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We can debate this forever, but the facts are on the table. The decisions are not going to change. If you want to make a decision personally to take grizzly bears, and you want to espouse that point of view, you want to talk to the public and you want to say that is a position that you, as the MLA for Tatchun, and that the Liberal Party supports that position, I encourage you to do that. I encourage you to stand before the public and take that position, if that is what you really believe in.

20 I am telling you that I do not believe in that position. This government has made a decision not to proceed on that route. There is a difference of opinion on this matter, and that is clear. The question of management that has been raised by the Member for Kluane and by the Member for Riverdale has been addressed.

It may not be addressed as quickly as some people would like it to be. Some people would see the situation as being very cut and dried. If you have a problem, you fix it. If it means helicopters and slugs, you do it. Unfortunately, sometimes problems are not that black and white. We have decided in this instance that there are a number of measures that we are going to take to try to alleviate the problem. It may take longer, but we are confident that the result will be the same. It may mean that some hunters will have to suffer for a number of years. They may not be able to go to an area that is accessible to get a moose every fall.

The hunters have spoken on that question. Many of them have said that they are willing to take that under consideration. They are willing to suffer until the moose recover.

The regulations have been relaxed to try to allow for people to have access to the grizzly bear population. They have been relaxed to try to bring their numbers down. Those are decisions that have been made. We have cut back on the hunting of moose and, hopefully, the decisions will have a cumulative effect over the long

term. We are going to be able to decrease the numbers of grizzlies to allow the moose to get out of the predator pit.

That is what is being debated here. Some people say that we should take the shortcut. I am not prepared to do that. I have given you the position that I have taken. It is very different from yours.

Chairman: We will now recess for 10 minutes.

Recess

21 Chairman: The Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

Mr. Brewster: I would just like to sum this up. It is very apparent that it is a policy decision. It is not a decision made on facts and figures. I wonder if the Minister has read all the reports that were turned over to the Select Committee, where all the biologists all over the world agreed that there was certainly something about this study. They look up to our biologists in the Yukon and think that they are doing a very good job. They have produced facts. In the back of that book there are only one or two biologists who completely condemn it. Some do not agree completely. They question a few things. I think it is quite correct.

The statement that he keeps saying, that he has taken action to protect it by allowing the hunters in to take so many moose for only two weeks. They are not going to scare the bears when they are in there. Number one, they do not have to go in there. That is rough country to kill a bear in so they are not going to do it.

We have done nothing to help the animals in there. Unfortunately, the animals cannot survive just because we have a policy. We cannot wait for the Select Committee, which will be in October. We have already lost another round of calves this year.

I trust that the Chairman of the Select Committee will receive a great deal of briefing from the biologist and that of the deputy minister. We have to make the decision. Apparently, it will not be made by the government. If we have to make it then we have to have the facts.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the question is, "can the department officials offer information to the Select Committee", clearly we can do that.

Mr. Coles: The Minister keeps alluding to the reproduction rates of the wolves and the reproduction rate of the bears. What is the reproduction rate of the moose? Is it that much better than the bears?

22 Hon. Mr. Porter: The cow moose calve every year provided that there are bulls around to make that possible. Sometimes, there are twins born to cows.

Mr. Coles: We are going to have to agree to disagree. There is no problem there. That is why some of us are in different parties than others.

I would like to make one thing clear, however, and that is that this is not Liberal Party policy. It is my own thinking. The Minister said the facts were all on the table. They are obviously not all on the table. The Minister has not listened to all the recommendations. We do not know what all the facts are. We have not even seen the recommendations.

I can say that I have spent a month on the Minister's committee travelling to every community in this territory. I know what the facts are, and what the people are thinking. It is going to be a grand day for this House when that report comes in. I hope that the Minister is going to listen to it.

I would like to know how many elk the government is going to be receiving from Elk Island Park in January? Does the Minister know that?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That number has not been determined. When they make a decision to move elk, they do not know either. It is simply a process of what they can round up to make available for the transfer.

Mr. Coles: Are the elk that the government is bringing in going to be distributed to people who are interested in elk farming?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There are two options that we are actively considering. The one that we would like to proceed on is to bring in a seed herd of elk. We will make the progeny of that seed herd

available to people who are interested in raising elk for farming and to make half of them available to transplant to the wild.

Mr. Coles: Has the department given any thought to how they are going to decide who gets the elk?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That will be determined on the basis of interest by the people who would apply. We would bring the elk in and we would be responsible for caring for them. What we intend to do is to recover the costs to government for the caring for these animals. We will probably look at some sort of fee basis to make the elk available to the agricultural community, if you will. Prior to making them available, we will have guidelines as to what we expect of the individuals who would choose to go into the elk ranching business.

Mr. Coles: What I am concerned about is that perhaps we are going to have a hundred people who are interested in raising elk, and fifty elk to get rid of. I wonder how the department is going to go about allocating them.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We will not have that kind of a situation because, for the most part, we will be limited by the market. The market would dictate the number of elk that we produce. There have been some dreamers who have looked to the horn market to make millions. Unfortunately, the horn market is acutely depressed. There has been a saturation of the market. New Zealand is in the marketplace in a big way, and they take a lot of deer horns to the market. As well, apparently some bad dealers in Korea were injecting the horns with fluid to increase the weight. That caused some real commotion in the marketplace and turned a lot of people off. We have a situation where, for example, the Chinese are restricting their purchases.

When you look at the marketplace, and if we are looking at the sale of horns, that is not, at this present time, a very good proposition. I think that what we are looking at is home consumption. It would have to be local because we would not be able to compete with southern ranching institutions that are now meeting the market demand, particularly the specialty market with respect to restaurants and hotels.

Mr. Coles: I am sure we all have been interested in aphrodisiacs from time to time. The long cold winters usually provide enough incentive for most of us, I think. Nevertheless, there is still a good market for elk meat and hide out there. There seems to be a lot of interest in the public in raising elk. I think the Minister and the department should consider developing regulations and guidelines now so that people interested in obtaining elk when the time comes will be prepared to do so.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I offer no comment as to what I think the Member does on those long cold winter nights. With respect to the elk, when they are here, clearly I think that the rule of thumb would be to give preference to those individuals, or groups of individuals, who demonstrate the most economically feasible proposals coupled with a proposal that suggests that they will take great care of the animals and have in place the necessary infrastructure that will guarantee the wellbeing of the animals.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister said the elk would be farmed out or spread out amongst one or two elk farmers, and some of the offspring would be turned loose in the wild. Could he tell me how they plan to do that and at what age?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are talking about the seed herd concept. The yearlings that were born in the Yukon — very much like the wood bison project — will be released into the wild.

Mr. Phillips: This brings up an interesting question. One elk farmer who I know right now has his elk in a fenced-in area. I imagine that is the concept that the Minister is talking about, that they will be in an enclosed area. A lot of these elk farmers have dogs and other animals around in the area, and the elk have been raised and hand fed for a year. The Minister has also told us that the reason the existing elk herd has not done well is because of predators. What is he going to do to these yearling calves that he turns loose to teach them that they cannot just run up to a wolf? The wolves are going to come after these young ones. They may not react the same way as the animals do in the wild, and the wolves will probably pick that out rather rapidly and just target these elk, and it will not work at all.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Apparently, dogs do not have much of a success rate with elk, and when they get in with elk, if they are not too careful they are killed by elk. That does not become a problem.

What we are looking at now is to almost climatize the yearlings. We are talking about releasing them in the vicinity of where they were born and then monitoring their activities.

Mr. Phillips: So he is not going to release the yearlings where we have existing elk herds now? He is going to release them in the vicinity where they are born? That is what the Minister just said.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, I did say that. I stand to be corrected — in the vicinity of the elk herds that are in the wild presently is the correct answer.

Mr. Phillips: Since the Minister is looking at enhancing the wild elk herds, and he has told us that predators are a problem of the wild elk herds, why does the Minister not go out and institute a predator control program in the vicinity of the wild herds and help them that way right now?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That should not be taken as a definitive statement. Earlier I stated that we suspected one of the reasons that the elk in the wild have not reproduced could very well be predation. We have not conducted a study on the elk in the wild in recent years, so we do not know, on a definitive basis, if predation is the sole and only reason.

There were studies done by Dr. Brackman, which cleared the animals of diseases; they are not diseased. The next question, logically, that the Member would raise is if we are going to do a study on the elk to determine if predation is the answer. My answer to that is no. In this budget that we are debating here, we have no funds allocated to undertaking such a study, but it would be something that we should look at and consider for future budgets.

Mr. Phillips: Is there money in this budget to bring in elk?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The understanding that we have had in discussions with officials of Elk Island is that there would be no direct costs to us other than transporting the animals to the Yukon and then taking care of them. Yes, we do have money to undertake the transportation.

Mr. Phillips: If the Minister is planning on bringing up the elk this year, and if the offspring will be released next year, why does the department not institute some kind of study to determine what the problem is with the elk.

He has already told us that the plan is to turn one-half of the elk loose, but he does not have any idea where he is turning them loose, except out to a herd that has a problem already. Why does the Minister not investigate the problem before he turns any elk loose?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That could very well be. I said that we were shooting for January to try to get the elk into the Yukon. That is our target. We may not achieve that. It may not be until the spring, and that will depend on how the Elk Island people respond. They have told us that they are in favour of such a transfer.

It may be that because of the need to do some studies that were alluded to, we can conduct the program on the basis of making elk available to those who have an agricultural interest in elk ranching prior to releasing the elk in the wild. So, it does not have to be decided today.

As soon as they are a year old, we do not necessarily have to split them off and send them out to the wild. We can, for the first season, deal in meat with the aspirations of those who want to go into elk ranching. Once we have put necessary policies in place and know the answers to questions about the release of the animals to the wild, then we can make that decision.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister said earlier that he had a couple of options. What was the other one? One was to give them to elk farmers and put some of them into the wild.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The option is to release the elk to individuals or groups of individuals for elk ranching or release them to the wilds.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister is now saying that after the first year, and if we get the elk this January, it might be two to four years before he releases any offspring to the wild after all the studies are done?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer that I gave to the Member would

suggest that as an alternative. We do not necessarily have to release the animals to the wild immediately. If we are of the opinion that the animals would not survive if released into the wild, it would seem that the most logical course of action would be to meet the local domestic needs for elk ranching prior to a program being designed to reintroduce and enhance the current elk herds.

Mr. Phillips: What about the commitment that was made to the members of the Fish and Game Association by the then Minister of Renewable Resources and the deputy minister, that if they assisted in the bison project, which they did to the tune of \$8,000, that they could use the money they raised from their raffles to bring up elk to be turned loose into the two areas where we have elk now, to replenish the herd?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Our intentions would be still to follow through with it. There are some unanswered questions. We are going to attempt to try to make the necessary arrangements so that we can be in a position to answer those questions.

Yes, if there was a commitment to bring elk up and to release them into the wild, I have stated that we will live up to that commitment and pursue a program that has that goal in mind.

Mr. Phillips: Is the Minister saying that his first option of releasing half the offspring is the program he is talking about, or is he talking about another shipment of elk to the Yukon, which he will release to the wild with assistance from the monies that the Fish and Game Association have raised?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, I think that we would want to undertake one program, to bring elk to the Yukon and then to set up a seed herd. The objective of the program would be then to make elk available to those people who want to go ranching, and the other objective would be to reintroduce to the wild a certain number of the progeny. That would meet the commitments that may have been made in the past to the Fish and Game Association.

Mr. Phillips: So the government Minister is saying that the commitment made to the Fish and Game Association will not be honoured the way it was made. The government is planning to change its priority to elk ranching first and then, if it has any elk left over in two or three years, it will make some available to the wild. The priority is no longer to honour that commitment to the Fish and Game Association; it is to enhance elk ranching.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I can understand private interests and personal interests in terms of government policy. I envision a situation where we can meet both demands for reintroduction of elk into the Yukon — both the agricultural ranching market and a program to reintroduce elk into the wild of the Yukon. We can do them both.

Mr. Brewster: I have listened to this debate quite interestingly, and I think we have the cart before the horse. I think it was in 1955 or 1956 that we brought 25 elk into the Yukon. We now have two herds, one with 30 and one with 40. I think we are very foolish to fool around with elk until we find out what happened to these elk.

If we go back into predator control, which is what I think it is, and if the Minister does not believe in that, then we are throwing away taxpayers' money to bring elk in to feed the wolves and the bears.

I would like to ask a few questions on the marten. Has the transplanting of the marten been a success, and is it continuing?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the Member is looking for specific numbers to indicate its success or failure rate, I do not have those. As I recall from discussions with department officials, it has been successful in some areas. It is viewed as a good program, and we are continuing it.

Mr. Brewster: As I understand it, these marten are put in certain areas where there are traplines. What measures are being taken to protect these, and are the trappers who cannot trap in those areas during that time compensated or protected?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have no personal knowledge of any compensation being given to trappers as an incentive not to trap martens. What happened is that where we have relocated transplanted marten we have closed the area to the trapping of marten.

Mr. Brewster: During Question Period I had asked if the buffalo had any diseases and I was told assuredly not, that a vet had been in and had seen them. I have no problem in believing that. If

there was nothing wrong with them, why was the hair sent out to Regina to be checked? Did the Minister make the statement to me that they were healthy before he got the report back on the hair from Saskatoon or Regina?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The reason why we sent the hair out was to be absolutely sure so that we could have some laboratory analysis on the condition of the buffalo. The reason that was determined accounted for the loss of hair was the climatic change from Alberta to the Yukon. That was seen as the reason for the early fallout of the hair.

With respect to the lab results, those were received before I gave a definitive answer to the Member. In other words, when I answered the question I had the information from the lab tests.

Mr. Phillips: I just have a couple of questions. One is on the goats on Mount White. Are they protected right now? Is that a protected area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Mr. Phillips: Is the government planning any changes in the Dempster Corridor, the widening of the Dempster Corridor, or is it going to be the same way this year?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There is no active consideration on changes presently. I have no regulations pending.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister mentioned in his speech that he gave a presentation in Edmonton on Saturday, "New Approaches to Environmental Management in Yukon". Will the Minister table that presentation in the House?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As our record will clearly indicate, we have been very amenable to trying to make available information to the side opposite. It will continue. I have no hesitation in tabling that particular document.

Given the fact that it is now approaching 9:30, I would move that you report progress on Bill No. 5.

Motion agreed to

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

Speaker: I will call the House to order. May we have a report from the Chairman of Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act, 1986-87*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare that the report has carried.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Government House Leader that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled May 26, 1986:

86-3-43

Land transfers received since May, 1985, and related correspondence (McDonald)

