



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 15

5th Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, April 20, 1982 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Robert Fleming, MLA, Campbell

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government House Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Public Service Commission, Land Claims and Intergovernmental Relations.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism and Economic Development.
Hon. Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for Municipal and Community Affairs, Highways and Public Works, Yukon Housing Corporation and Yukon Liquor Corporation
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Education and Heritage and Cultural Resources
Hon. Howard Tracey	Tatchun	Minister responsible for Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Government Services and Workers' Compensation Board.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Robert Fleming	Campbell
Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West
Maurice Byblow	Faro
Roger Kimmerly	Whitehorse South Centre

(Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

(Independent)

Grafton Njootil	Old Crow
-----------------	----------

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

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

Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, April 20, 1982

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

DAILY ROUTINE

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Documents or Returns for Tabling?

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have for tabling, "Land: A Yukon Resource".

Mr. Speaker: Reports of Committees?

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. Hanson: I have for tabling the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Petitions?
Reading or Receiving of Petitions?
Introduction of Bills?

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill No. 28 *An Act to Amend the Personal Properties Security Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that Bill No. 28 *An Act to Amend the Personal Properties Security Act* be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

⁰² **Hon. Mr. Lattin:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Mayo, that Bill No. 13 *An Act to Amend the Government Employee Housing Plan Act*, be now introduced and read for a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill No. 13 entitled *An Act to Amend the Government Employee Housing Plan Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Campbell, that Bill No. 32 *An Act to Amend the Municipal Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that a Bill entitled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Minister of Renewable Resources, that Bill No. 27 entitled *An Act to Amend the Civil Emergency Measures Act and the Municipal Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development, that a Bill entitled *An Act to Amend the Civil Emergency Measures Act and the Municipal Act*, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Bills for Introduction?
Are there any Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?
Notices of Motion?
Are there any Statements by Ministers?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Pearson: With some pride, I am tabling today a document called "Land: A Yukon Resource". This is a Government Policy Paper, which contains the framework of a land use policy for Yukon. I say with pride, because the Government recognizes, accepts and supports the deeply felt attachment of Yukoners to the land.

⁰³ Ever since our election, we have been working towards the day when Yukon residents could share in the planning, the allocation and benefits of their Yukon land.

Our Government policy on land has faithfully reflected the platform of the Yukon Progressive Conservative Party. There are two fundamentals in that platform. One is the expeditious and just settlement of the Indian Land Claims. As I have said time and time again, that is our top priority and the result to date reflects that priority. A settlement is one of the keys to Yukon's future.

Equally important to us is the *quid pro quo* to the settlement of Land Claims, and that is the transfer of Federal land to the Crown in right of Yukon. At present, two-tenths of one percent of Yukon's 186,000 square miles is controlled by the Government of Yukon. The remainder is effectively controlled and administered by Ottawa bureaucrats who have shown themselves to be insensitive to Yukoners' lifestyles and aspirations.

The Government has always recognized the link between Indian Land Claims and the broader Yukoner's claim. As long as much work remains to be done in the Land Claims negotiations, it would have been premature and perhaps prejudicial for the Government to publish its General Land Use Policy proposals. However, considerations of the Land Claims negotiations did not stop the Federal Government from publishing its version of a General Land Use Policy last summer.

That Policy, not surprisingly, emphasized control from Ottawa, and minimal territorial and local control. It would create yet another layer of bureaucracy. It was totally unacceptable to the Government of Yukon.

The paper I am tabling today contains our response and I emphasize that it is a thoroughly constructive response. It is designed with much thought and consultation to be a co-operative model for the future.

⁰⁴ The second reason for releasing this document now is the progress we have made in the Land Claims negotiations. There comes a time to send a signal to Ottawa that is loud and clear and that is that all Yukoners expect access to land once the claims are settled.

It is important to note that the Council of Yukon Indians agrees with us. The CYI has publicly stated that once claims are settled, the balance of land should be transferred to Yukon and be made available to non-Native Yukoners.

There are now fully 20 separate component agreements-in-principle in the Land Claims negotiations. Some have already been made public by mutual agreement. They stand as evidence of the good faith and determined hard work of all the negotiators.

Today, we are saying to CYI that we remain totally committed to reaching a satisfactory conclusion in the negotiations as quickly as possible. At the same time, we are saying to all Yukoners that we have been working diligently to prepare for the day when the Land Claims are settled, and when the Federal Government should be prepared to transfer the balance of land.

The paper I am releasing describes the purposes of a land use plan. It outlines the criteria which we believe are needed for an effective land use policy. Briefly, we are proposing the following:

1. Territorial legislation for land use planning.
2. The creation of a Yukon land use planning board and committees on which Yukon people will be the major participants.
3. The division of Yukon into planning districts and the development of district plans.
4. The transfer of land from Federal to Territorial jurisdictions once the district land use plans have been adopted.
5. The allocation of land to Yukoners in accordance with district land use plans.

05 As I have said before, the Government of Yukon has a duty to plan and to lead for tomorrow as well as to govern today. Yukoners have a right to expect progress on these very basic matters. Our commitment has never been in doubt. Today we are, once again, delivering on that commitment. I am confident that all Yukoners will welcome this land use policy.

Mr. Penikett: While we might welcome a policy, I do want to express some annoyance that we did not get this important statement until a few minutes before coming into the House. Having registered that objection, though, and noting that the Government Leader spoke with pride, I would remind him that pride comes before a fall.

He said, in his statement, that "the policy is basically reflective of the platform of the Yukon Progressive Conservative Party", and I would like to state for the record on this subject the policy of my Party, which was published in 1978. I want to do that on this subject because that policy was so grossly misrepresented by a spokesman of the Party opposite on CBC Radio the other day. The policy makes it quite clear that, in accordance with the Government statement, the Federal Government does control the vast majority of Yukon land; that we believe that the conflicts over Yukon land can only justly be settled by Yukoners and, my Party policy resolves that the Yukon NDP call on the Federal Government to settle, justly and expeditiously, the Yukon Indian Land Claims in a way which is acceptable; complete the land use inventory of all Yukon land and transfer control of all land outside parks and Indian control to Yukon authorities following a settlement.

We also proposed, at that time, a Yukon lands commission, which would be staffed and directed by Yukon residents from all walks of life, which commission would evaluate and allocate all Territorial lands through comprehensive land use planning and management programs.

We also, and I want to emphasize this, proposed the making of the supply of private housing land sufficient to meet the demand a top priority.

06 I wanted to emphasize that because, as Members opposite will see, the policy that we published four years ago and adopted at our convention is, in many of its principle respects, very similar to the one that has just been published by the Progressive Conservative Government.

We are pleased, therefore, that they have accepted our leadership on this issue and are choosing to adopt a co-operative model, as noted in here.

We wait with interest to hear what CYI has to say about this. I notice that the Government Leader has said that they are agreeable.

In terms of the five points that he briefly summarized in his statement today, I want to say that we may have questions about particulars, but we are generally agreeable. The zoning principle which is at the core of the statement was first implemented on a province-wide basis in British Columbia by an NDP Government. The Government here already has a very useful piece of legislation in the area of the *Development Ordinance* in terms of being able to implement some of these things. We look forward to the other legislation though.

In closing, I want to say that I am also pleased to note the Government's statement in respect to planning and their obligation and duty to plan and lead for tomorrow. We just express regret that they have not found the will and the means to do the same in respect to the local economy.

Mr. Veale: I am amazed. The closer we get to this election, the fancier the covers become on the Government announcements. It is a very small announcement, about eight pages, and could have been done up on a more economical basis. It is a document that I expect will be a very useful working document in the Land Claims process. I sincerely hope that that is what the Government Leader is, in fact, doing now; staking out a position that is going to be negotiated in that process. If it is designed to some how go around that process then we are going to be in exactly the same position we were in the fall when the *Municipal Ordinance* was proclaimed and there was a great deal of concern by all parties in the Yukon about the speed and the method by which that Ordinance was being proclaimed.

07 I wonder, in terms of talking about land policy, whether the Government has done its homework so that we will not have another situation like we had in the fall. By that I mean, in the agricultural policy, has the ground work been laid so that there is not going to be that endless

round of bickering that sets back the Land Claim process rather than moves it forward as we would all hope.

I should also like to state that to some extent I think Yukoners should mourn this moment because it is the passing of an age, an age where there was a great deal of freedom to use land in this Territory as you saw fit. That age no longer exists and we are now entering on the zoning process of planning boards — all of which we believe are necessary processes to enter upon — but the result is invariably more government and less freedom for Yukoners.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I must react to some of the statements that were made.

To the Leader of the Liberal Party this might be a pretty small thing. It is obvious that Yukon land has been pretty small potatoes to the Liberal Government in Ottawa for the last number of years. It is because of that very Government and their political policies that we cannot get land in this Territory and that we have not been able to get land. I will be more than willing to make this a real issue in any forthcoming election, whether land is going to be available or whether land is not going to be available. I want, is very well recorded that it is because of the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa that we cannot get land in this Territory, that nobody can get land in this Territory. We have been negotiating since 1973, side by side with the Indian people, in respect to this.

08 This policy goes hand in hand with the Land Claims process we are in. We know exactly what the CYI's reaction to it is because they have been clear on what their policy is in respect to Yukoners acquiring land. We still have not received that clarity from the Government of Canada.

A copy of this paper has been presented to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development this afternoon. I would encourage the Leader of the Liberal Party to phone his colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and tell him that he thinks this is a good idea, that it is a good policy and one that the people of the Territory want and to have his co-operation so that we can put it into place.

There has been a lot of bickering, and it has all been with the Liberal Government. The interesting thing about this is that this bickering started in 1973 and the only consistent part of it has been the Liberal Government in Ottawa. The bickering has not been with anyone else.

There has not been any freedom in respect to land in this Territory. The Leader of the Liberal Party can say all he wants about how there has been freedom to do whatever you will in this Territory. He knows, just like I know, that simply is not so.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Statements by Ministers? We will then proceed to the Question Period.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: Revenue estimates

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Government Leader in his capacity as Minister of Finance. According to the Yukon Chamber of Mines, there was a 37 percent decline in mineral production in Yukon last year and the outlook for 1982 is equally gloomy. As recent mine cutbacks and closures are bearing this prediction out, will the Government Leader now state that he is prepared to revise his revenue estimates for 1982-83?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am not prepared to state that at all. We do, in the course of discussing the Budget, get to those revenue figures in the normal course of events. I am sure that I will be able to satisfy the Leader of the Opposition's great interest, all of a sudden, in matters financial in this Territory when we get to them.

Mr. Penikett: More probably, we should refer to the Government Leader's sudden discovery of my interest. Does the Government have a firm arrangement with the Federal Government whereby if Yukon's own revenue sources are not as great as predicted in the 1982-83 estimate the Federal Government will then automatically increase the deficit granted to Yukon to balance the Budget?

09 **Hon. Mr. Pearson:** I am sorry, I did not hear the first few words. I think what the Leader of the Opposition asked was if we had some sort of fail-safe agreement. No we do not. We negotiate our deficit

grant each year.

Mr. Penikett: When the gross Territorial product actually declines in 1982, as all economic indicators have been showing it will, if the Federal Government does not automatically increase the deficit grant — as the Government Leader has just indicated — could I ask the Government Leader what new tax increases he is now studying in order to balance the Budget, which he said he is intending to do?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: There must be an election coming. That is fear tactics.

The Leader of the Opposition has got to remember that he was sitting on those benches when this Government, with all of its projections, saw its way through a very lengthy strike by the major industrial producers in this Territory. Our revenue projections managed that strike like they will manage the present downturn.

Question re: Transportation Policy Review

Mr. Veale: It is unfortunate the Government does not know when the election is coming.

My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding the Transportation Policy Review. A number of submissions have been made by the people as a result of advertisements, either from the industry or from consumers. Will the Minister be making all the submissions public prior to bringing forward the new transportation policy?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think the Member opposite has made one fundamental error in his statement and that is that they have been making no submissions to me.

They have been making those submissions to an independent body, the Transport Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Veale: I am sure the Minister forgot that they were doing it at the request of the Minister. I am asking the Minister if he is requesting the Transport Public Utilities Board to make those documents public before the policy review is complete?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes, they did do it on my behalf. I asked them to review the total transportation industry in the Territory for a very good reason. We were having a significant amount of problems. Perhaps the Member across the floor should read the *Transport Public Utilities Ordinance* because the Transport and Public Utilities Board is a semi-judicial body. It can call its own evidence and it is up to the Board whether they want to release it or not.

Mr. Veale: I am distressed to learn that the Minister is not going to take responsibility for his own board, a creation of his own department. However, my question is that the board has said that some interested parties may be asked to expand upon their submissions verbally. In other words, some will be treated one way, some will be treated another way. Will the Minister insist to the board that the hearings be made public and that all the submissions be publicized in advance?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think that the Member across the floor should speak to the Transport Public Utilities Board. To the best of my knowledge they are holding public meetings whenever they are dealing with these people. I do not have any problem with them holding public meetings. If they want public meetings that is their right. They can call their own meetings. They have the power to sit on their own motion. They are an independent board and they are doing a job for the Government and if they feel that they should speak verbally to any trucking company, I guess that that is the right of the board.

Question re: MacMillan Pass developments

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Minister of Economic Development. It is on the subject of the MacMillan Pass developments. In a development report released this year, and done by Stanley and Associates, the need for a Phase II study was highlighted in the report. That is, a need for a Regional Land Use Planning Review. Can the Minister confirm that this study is progressing and has not been tentatively stalled in light of economic conditions?

Hon. Mr. Lang: There is a certain amount of work still going on. It appears to me that we will get another year from under the General Development Agreement for the renewable resource part of the Subsidiary Agreement and that will allow us to continue our inventory and the cataloguing of information that we have compiled over the course

of last year. I think that it is fair to say that there is going to be some work continuing this coming year.

Mr. Byblow: Has this Government development a position respecting preference for either a fly-in or the new community development concept? In other words, is the Government in favour of having workers commute to the mining areas from the existing settlements as opposed to developing a new community, as mentioned in the Stanley Report?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I have been accused many times of giving a lengthy reply and I would not want that to continue. No, no firm policy has been made.

Mr. Byblow: Further on the subject, can the Minister offer any explanation as to why there is no representation from any mine labour on the Task Force?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that that question is asking an opinion of the Minister. If the Minister wishes to answer it, proceed.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Member opposite knows full well that the original intent of the Task Force was to get all the actors together that were directly putting money into the area and that is why the representation is the way it presently exists. If, at a later date, we see reason to change the representation, I can sincerely say to the Member opposite that I will take the appropriate action.

Question re: Society Ordinance

Mr. Njootli: I would like to ask the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs some questions. If a society, which has become a society under the *Society Ordinance*, is it general procedure to file the constitution for that particular society in his department? Does the Minister agree or disagree?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: Yes it is. It is a requirement that it be filed in our department.

Mr. Njootli: What does the department do in the case of certain societies not following the by-laws of their constitution?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think that the only requirement is that it be filed. I think it is the membership of the society that has to make the change in the actual society. The only requirement of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is that the constitution of their society is registered with the Government.

Mr. Njootli: On the same subject, my final supplementary is directed to the Minister of Renewable Resources, who was Acting Government Leader during the absence of the Government Leader, who was celebrating the Canadian Constitution. I channeled a document to the Government last Thursday concerning the Old Crow-Whitehorse political situation. I would like to ask the then Government Leader what the concensus was concerning that document?

Hon. Mr. Lang: If the Member is referring to his ability to run as a candidate under a certain political party, it is very clear that it requires the signature of the Leader to give that blessing to each candidate in each riding, and that is under the *Elections Ordinance*.

Question re: Landlord and Tenant Ordinance

Mr. Kimmerly: A question to the Minister responsible for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The Minister previously announced amendments to the *Landlord and Tenants Ordinance* to occur this Session. Is the Minister still planning to pass the amendments this Session?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: They will be tabled in the House and much of whether it is going to be passed or not will depend on the Opposition across the floor. The way they have been acting the past week, I am beginning to wonder if we will ever get through this Session.

Mr. Kimmerly: With respect to trailers, is it now Government policy that stall rentals are covered by the same terms as our other residential tenancies?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would suggest that the Member across the floor wait until I table the bill.

Mr. Kimmerly: Is the proposed mediation function under the new legislation going to cover the question of the amount of rent?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I will give the same answer as I gave for the last one. He can wait to see the bill.

Question re: Haines Junction power units

Mrs. McGuire: Just a short question to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. I would like an update on a question I put to the Minister involving inadequate power units at Haines Junction on November 16, 1981, to which the Minister said he would make every effort to correct the situation. Could the Minister now give me an update as to what corrections were made?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I thank the Member for her question so I can give her the actual facts. I will take that question under advisement. Probably when we are discussing Municipal Affairs, I will have the answer. If not, I will give her a written reply to her question.

Question re: ERPU statistics

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Government Leader. According to this Government figure, there are over 550 employable Yukoners presently receiving social assistance. Can the Government Leader say if these people are included in the ERPU statistics as unemployed members of the Yukon Labour Force?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, I cannot. It is possible that the Minister responsible for ERPU could.

Mr. Penikett: Perhaps that Minister might entertain a supplementary in which he could answer that question and the one I would now ask. According to the figures from the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, there are, additionally, approximately 100 employable Native people receiving social assistance from the Federal Government. Are these people included in the YTG statistics for unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I recognize the Member opposite puts a great deal of merit in statistics. Before I respond, I would like to assure the Member opposite that he does not have to go to the Government Leader to address questions to me. On the first part of his question, as far as I know, I believe they are taken into account. I will have to double-check with the department to make sure that is an accurate statement. I will have to take notice on the second part of his question.

Mr. Penikett: Perhaps if the Government Leader can answer now I would appreciate an answer. According to the Federal Employment Centre, there are at least 1500 Yukoners presently receiving Unemployment Insurance who are actively seeking work. Could the Government Leader or the Minister confirm that there are therefore 2100 unemployed persons now in Yukon giving us an unemployment rate of at least 15.6 percent, which would make us the highest, not the second highest, in the country.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I recognize that the Member opposite always likes to be first in certain things. I would say to the Member opposite, in respect to the unemployment situation in a general sense, it is at the time of the year fairly high, we are coming to the end of the winter.

I want to assure the Member opposite that with the Capital Budget that we have put forward, I think that will take a lot of pressure off the unemployment situation. Further to that, I think his third supplementary question referred back to his second one and as I indicated, I would take notice in trying to get those specifics answered for the Member opposite.

Question re: Local Improvement Districts financing

Mr. Veale: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs a question regarding the financing for Local Improvement Districts. He indicated that his department has not asked LID's to do a twelve-month budget with funding for nine months.

Can the Minister advise why the LID's are being asked at this time to resubmit or reassess their budget requirements for 1982?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: As the Member across the floor is aware, in the statement I made the other day in the House in reference to changing when the *Municipal Act* will come into being, we are trying to get them on a calendar year basis, so there are some.

What the Member across the floor is trying to portray is that we are not giving the municipalities the money that we said we were. I want to emphatically deny that. I want to put it on the record that we are not. There is no doubt that because of the change in the Act there will be some changes. To try to imply that we are denying the money that we said we were giving is not what is taking place.

Mr. Veale: I am just trying to find out what is taking place. Will the Government then be doing some form of deficit financing to meet

the budget requirements for the latter part of the year of 1982 for the LID's?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Nobody is talking about deficit financing. Certainly not.

Mr. Veale: Except for the entire Budget. Would the Minister advise if the change in the implementation date of the *Municipal Act* has brought about the demand to the LID's to reassess their budget?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I thought I had made that plain in question number one that because of that there was some discussion. I still stand firm on what I said.

Question re: Government travel arrangements

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Minister responsible for Government Services. It is my understanding that a new branch of Government Services has been created for the express purpose of making travel arrangements for Government employees. Since this appears to be in conflict with services provided by the public sector, I would like to ask the Minister to state what Government policy change precipitated this move?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I would like to clear up one thing right off the bat. We are not in conflict and we are not competing with private enterprise. We have centralized our travel requirements in the Government within the Department of Government Services. Every department has to go through Government Services in order to make their travel arrangements.

Government Services then does all the footwork to find out where they are going to go, what method of transportation they are going to use, and then they contact the travel agencies and get the tickets booked through them. None of the travel agencies have lost any money. In fact it has been very beneficial for some of them. We make sure that if a person is travelling from Faro, their ticket will be purchased from Faro instead of being purchased from Whitehorse. Actually, it has been more beneficial than harmful.

The constituent in the Members' constituency who owns a travel agency is actually better off now than before we centralized it.

Mr. Byblow: I do not believe I brought up the matter of any constituency problems. I think the Minister will agree that the creation of this branch invites a duplication of services, in that the travel agencies under whose name the ticket is actually issued still have to check and verify the information.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the Honourable Member is now engaging in debate.

Mr. Byblow: Given then that the branch has required computer services to interconnect with the airlines, is it the intention of Government to eventually ticket directly with the airlines themselves in order to eliminate the duplication I was just talking about?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I can give an emphatic no to that. I have said this, I have written it in letters, it has been confirmed with everyone of those agencies. We have no intention of going into the travel agency business. The only reason for centralizing the travel was to save us money. It has saved this Government a significant amount of money to be able to centralize travel.

Mr. Byblow: We will question the saving of money in the Budget. I understand that there is fairly sophisticated training required by the branch, involving some international seminars as part of the training process. Given that this Government's international travel is fairly limited I would like to inquiry of the Minister if he can afford an explanation for the extent of this type of training?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: There is very little international travel involved. I do not know what the Member across the floor is trying to get at. It is certainly a necessity for the person who books all the travel to know how to get the cheapest and most efficient way to travel. That is the reason why that person gets the training. It is not different than somebody who gets training in a travel agency, in many respects. They are doing the same type of thing. The only reason that we centralized it was because every department was booking travel and we were not getting the advantage of having the most efficient way to travel.

Question re: Old Crow PC Nomination Convention

Mr. Njootli: I direct this question to the Honourable Government Leader. When the Progressive Conservative nomination was taking

place in Old Crow, the Government Leader promised me that he and Erik Nielsen would be in Old Crow on that nomination date. Does the Government Leader have any information as to why that did not take place?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I phoned the Honourable Member as a courtesy on Good Friday, on a holiday in fact, and told him that I was considering travelling to Old Crow. I did that as a courtesy, as I would to any other Member of this House. Because of circumstances, it turned out that I could not go. There was no talk of a nomination meeting nor was there even a suggestion of a nomination.

Mr. Njootli: I remember many times in Caucus that I told the Honourable Member that there would be a nomination meeting in Old Crow sooner or later. Does he extend these courtesies to other constituencies?

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

Mr. Njootli: Same topic, on an election issue, from one good Conservative to another. In view of the unstable relationship between Yukon and Ottawa, and also in view of the fact that an election has not been called yet and the Progressive Conservative Government may already have two existing MLA's running as Independents in the next election, does he realize it would be politically damaging to call an election at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That question is quite out of order. If the Honourable Government Leader wishes to answer it, please proceed.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I want to say that was not a question from one good Progressive Conservative to another good Progressive Conservative. No matter how the Honourable Member tries, or how much he wishes he really and truly has alienated himself with me and with this Party. I regret that very much, but it is a fact. The sooner the Honourable Member accepts it as a fact, the better off everyone will be.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to say from the Chair that such questions are an abuse of the Question Period and perhaps detract somewhat from the dignity of the House. I must say it offers some levity, which is always welcome in the House, but should be avoided.

Question re: Workers' Compensation

Mr. Kimmerly: A question responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board. The Government promised legislation to alter the Workers' Compensation system in the Throne Speech. Can the Minister indicate if the legislation is intended for this Session?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I do not know what is the matter with that Member across the floor. We said in the Throne Speech that we were going to bring in Workers' Compensation legislation. That is exactly what I was prepared to do and will be doing.

Mr. Kimmerly: The Throne Speech stated that under the present system some claimants were overcompensated. Can the Minister indicate which categories of claimants are now overcompensated?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Member across the floor will find that out as well as he will find out whatever else is going to happen in the Workers' Compensation Legislation once the Workers' Compensation Legislation is tabled and we deal with it in Committee of the Whole. Until then I am not prepared to answer any questions on the bill.

Mr. Kimmerly: What effect are the changes to the *Workers' Compensation Act* expected to have in affecting the rates for coverage?

Mr. Speaker: That question I would presume to be out of order inasmuch as the Minister has refused to answer any further questions in respect to that matter.

Question re: Tourist advertising costs

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. I had some confusion in the figures for advertising. The Minister publicly stated that of the number of people who crossed the border into Yukon in 1981, 386,000 were identified as visiting tourists, a raise of approximately 13.5 percent over 1980. Was that percentage factor brought into consideration in the Minister's analysis of the tourist advertising costs, where he announced a 1,200 percent increase in visitors' parties to Yukon. How do these two figures relate?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think the Member opposite is referring to the Coupon Conversion Study that I tabled the day before yesterday. I did

not realize that it was the major pressing issue, in the last couple of days, as far as Question Period is concerned. There are some technical reasons and they are done by a mathematical type of equation. If the Member is interested in how we derived those figures and what figures were used in assumptions to get the final results that were in this Conversion Study, which was done independently, I will make those people go to the Member opposite so that it can be fully explained in detail. I would not want to bore you with a very technical explanation because I have been accused, by Members across the way, of giving lengthy replies.

Mrs. McGuire: In spite of the high increase that he has announced, I would like to ask the Minister the following question. In 1980, magazine advertising costs were \$138,000 and the tourist count declined 21,734 from the year 1979, when no advertising monies were spent. Will the Minister explain the decline, in spite of his advertising campaign during 1980?

Mr. Speaker: I would think, from the Chair, that that would be a very difficult question for anyone to answer inasmuch as we are asking for statistical data. Perhaps the Honourable Member may consider the possibility of putting a written question in respect of this, inasmuch as it covers subjects which cannot be easily answered by Ministers.

Mrs. McGuire: I do not find that last question difficult. However, I would like to ask the Minister the cost of the YTG Tourism Advertising Program evaluation analysis that was done in Vancouver for 1980-81? I do not believe that that was ever brought up.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I do not believe that the Member opposite asked me the question before. It was done under the Tourist Subsidiary Agreement and I can provide the Member opposite with that particular information. In respect to her earlier question about 1980 and 1979, I think there was a combination of factors. One was the energy situation as it existed at that time. I think that it did have an adverse effect in respect to the tourism industry.

As far as this report is concerned, and the Member opposite is not giving the Government the credit it should be given, the way we are marketing with the Yukon Visitors Association is, obviously, much more effective than the previous manner we were marketing and much more successful. I think that is the key ingredient that we should be looking at. The reason for the study was to give us an idea just exactly how effective our marketing was.

By the copy of this report, one can see that it was very effective and it is one that we will continue on over the course of this year. Perhaps the Member opposite does not feel that that type of expenditure should be made. We can debate that. This Party, and this Government, has a commitment to tourism because we recognize the importance of it to the Yukon.

18

Question re: Northland Park

Mr. Penikett: I am sure that only a loan shark would give the Member opposite credit. Let me ask my old friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs a question. Two weeks ago the Minister promised to find out whether the water line to Northland Park is adequate for fire protection. Can the Minister now confirm that the line to Northland Park is inadequate for fire protection?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I have not had a detailed report on that. It is my understanding that it is.

Mr. Penikett: According to the City, there is some doubt on that question, in that the Northland Development will need a new water line before Phase II of the development can begin. The City takes the position that the developer should cover the costs. I would like to ask the Minister if he has been in discussions on this question and if the Government is considering subscribing to the costs of such a line?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: To the best of my knowledge we have had no discussions with the City on this particular problem. I am sure that, if there is perceived to be a problem, we have a very good association and communication with the City and if it is deemed necessary to have a meeting with the City, we certainly will.

Mr. Penikett: If, and when, the new addition to the Correctional Centre is built, a new water line will probably be required to that place. I would like to ask the Minister if this Government has been considering ways and means of improving the water line for that facility, but also make it available to the other developments in the area on a

cost-shared basis?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: If we do some upgrading on water to the Correctional Institute, this Government, being a very good Government, and utilizing our facilities to the best of our ability, I am certain that we would consider that.

Question re: North Yukon

Mr. Njootli: As a Member with no authority to respond to any Ministerial Statements made in the House, I would like to use the Question Period to get information from the Ministers. If the last question was too hard to the Government Leader, I want to apologize. I direct the same question to the same Government Leader. In view of the fact that Progressive Conservatives' major concerns are aimed at extra-territorial Inuit and Indian Land Claims, has the Government received any good words from any negotiators in regards to North Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The Member seems to be misinformed to some degree. Our concern is not extra-territorial at all. Our concerns, in respect to COPE, which the Honourable Member should recall quite vividly — because I do know that he has been part of delegations from this Government that have gone to Ottawa on behalf of this Government in respect to COPE — deal 100 percent, and only, with Yukon lands, and have nothing to do with extra-territorial lands at all.

Mr. Njootli: As there are extra-territorial people interested in Yukon lands, and also because my constituents are worried about the long drawn-out talks on Land Claims, can the people of Old Crow be reassured that a settlement will soon come to pass?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I assume that the Honourable Member is talking about the COPE Agreement-in-Principle. The latest word that we have had from the Government of Canada is that somehow or another they are going to have to open up negotiations again on COPE. We, as a Government, have been assured by the Government of Canada that should that transpire, when they are talking about Yukon lands in the future, we will be part of the negotiations.

Mr. Njootli: That answers exactly what I was trying to get at. However, I hope that the coming talks will not last another ten years. Because of the claims which are already signed and implemented, and in view of the fact that people would have to be seconded to CYI, or whoever is going to administer and implement the mass responsibilities of these particular claims, I ask the Government Leader if he is prepared to launch an exchange program with the Indian people after the final agreement?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The COPE Agreement-in-Principle has been signed. Those portions, sections 12 and 14, which apply to Yukon, have not been implemented.

Question re: Yukon Agricultural Development Council

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources regarding the Yukon Agricultural Development Council. The Minister has promised that land will be available under Yukon jurisdiction this spring. When will the Council actually be receiving and entertaining applications from interested citizens of Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Lang: My understanding is that the application forms are presently being printed, and once that is done, I would assume that the Chairman, with his two colleagues, will state publicly when they will be receiving applications and, subsequently, asking for them to come forward. I would expect within the month. No later than that.

Mr. Veale: Will the Minister advise if the support staff for the Council will be hired and be available at that time to assist them in assessing those applications?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We will be using our resources from both the Renewable Resource side as well as the Municipal Affairs side to give the necessary support in respect to reviewing the various applications and also requesting expertise, when necessary, from those federal departments that would be affected.

Mr. Veale: Some of these applications may involve compensation for other land users, like trappers. Will the Minister be bringing in the third-party compensation legislation under the *Wildlife Ordinance* this Session?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We are presently working at it. Looking at the actions of the Members opposite, we may well have time to consider it

before the end of the Session.

Question re: Recreation review process

Mr. Byblow: I have a question for the Minister of Education in her capacity of having responsibility for recreation. It is on the subject of the recreation review process presently underway. I would like to ask the Minister if she can advise whether cultural and heritage policy is included in the terms of reference of that review presently in progress?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Department of Heritage and Cultural Resources is involved with this review. The subject of Heritage and Cultural Development is partially included in the review, but mostly the cultural component of recreation is more directed to the community arts.

Mr. Byblow: Is the Minister's department's position that any recreational realignment will include culture? That is, is culture included in the Minister's definition and subsequent funding of recreation?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It depends on your definition of culture. There are many definitions of culture. The component of recreation that involves culture, if you want to use the word, is community arts. The word "culture" to me has a much broader meaning and is much more all-encompassing as in the culture of our Indian people or our own culture. It is a much broader term and cannot be used in recreation. Community arts is more the description of the cultural component of recreation.

Mr. Byblow: It appears that the Minister is creating a definition of culture, which is precisely what I asked. Since, by many definitions of cultural activities, any definition would include the umbrella of recreation, could I then ask the Minister why the Cultural and Heritage Resource Department was created prior to the completion of this review?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Cultural and Heritage Resources Department is quite separate and complements the cultural component in recreation which, as I have stated many times, is community arts. My definition of culture is not my own, it is from the dictionary.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the Question Period and we will proceed to Orders of the Day under Government Bills and Orders.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Bill No. 26: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second Reading, Bill No. 26, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill No. 26 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Bill No. 26 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The Yukon Territory was the first jurisdiction in Canada to enter into the agreements on the Hague Convention.

²¹ Since the agreement has been entered into, there has been some changes that have been recommended. We have introduced them in this bill. Except for changing words like "Commissioner" to "Commissioner in Executive Council Member" and "Ordinance" to "Act", we are only making a couple of small changes.

On the recommendation of the Committee who drafted the uniform bill, we are changing the definition from effective date to make it the date the convention comes into force because it would only come into force when 15 nations have ratified it. The second change we are making is to make it clear that any expense that we give to a parent seeking to get his child out of our jurisdiction will only be what we would be prepared to pay under Legal Aid. We would not be required to pay the total cost of some person from some extra-territorial jurisdiction. We would not have to pay their legal fees. We want to restrict it to the cost of legal aid.

Mr. Kimmerly: The bill is uncontroversial and we will support it.
Motion agreed to

Bill No. 21: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Bill No. 21, Second Reading standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Campbell, that Bill No. 21 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell, that bill No. 21 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 23: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Bill No. 23, Second Reading standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek West, that Bill No. 23 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Porter Creek West, that Bill No. 23 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: The proposed amendments are to increase the third party liability minimum insurance requirements for motor vehicles, as I committed this side of the House to do in the last Session. We are increasing it from \$75,000 to \$100,000. There are additional amendments, but I would like to speak about this one for a minute.

The reason we did not go beyond \$100,000 was because we were afraid of what would happen. Our replies from the insurance company were that we would have a general increase in the cost of insurance if we were to go above \$100,000.

²² The increase, which is going to be caused by us increasing from \$75,000 to \$100,000, is going to be between \$4 and \$20. If we were to go any higher, we could significantly increase that cost.

The present limits of \$75,000 have been in effect since 1978. Seven provincial jurisdictions have increased their liability minimum over the past four years to \$100,000 while Ontario, the only one, has gone to \$200,000 on March 3, 1981.

We have also made one other change in the Act and that is to increase the personal liability part of it to 95 percent from the existing 75 or 80 percent. We have increased that because we felt that people were more important than the vehicle or the property. If the total claim against the insurance was to be the maximum then people would get the most instead of somebody getting paid first for their personal property.

Mr. Byblow: I think, as the Minister indicates, the Act is quite in order. I think it is a natural consequence of inflation having forced the necessities for a safeguard to be more in-line with what the current liabilities suits are perhaps running at. I think many individuals have responded already by opting to higher amounts on their own. It is probably safe to say that some of the amounts suggested here are still lower than what most motorists assume in their own policies. We will certainly be supporting this.

Mr. Veale: Speaking to the matter of the increases in principle, our Party is in favour of the increases coming through. I am very concerned though, that there seems to be a greater amount of attention paid to the premium that will be required to be paid than to the victim, the person who is actually struck by an automobile and severely injured. It is common knowledge that claims now are, on a regular basis, exceeding \$100,000 by a substantial amount, and exceeding \$200,000 in many cases. Many people are advised by their insurance broker to have from \$500,000 to \$1 million. My belief is that the amount should be increased to \$200,000, based on the fact that we have an extensive system and we travel is probably one of the major means of communication. That sets us apart from other parts of the country. I would certainly encourage the Minister to return to his advisors and see what the actual increases are going to be in premiums to take it right up to the \$200,000 level.

²³ **Hon. Mr. Tracey:** We were not just looking at premiums. What I stated was that it would raise the total insurance package to everyone in the Yukon Territory if we were to increase it more.

The insurance companies would likely increase their base, which would increase everybody's insurance, regardless of whether they had \$75,000 or if they had a \$1,000,000. It would still increase that base.

We recognize that most people in the Territory have at least \$200,000 and many have \$500,000 or \$1 million. What we were afraid

of, was to increase the base. If we increased the base, we would increase the total insurance for everybody.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister having twice spoken has now closed debate. Are you prepared for the question?

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 20: Second Reading

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Lattin.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 20 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved the Honourable Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development, that Bill Number 20 be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I speak to this Act with pleasure as a need which was recognized earlier, and I made a commitment in line with that need.

Most sections of the Act are in direct line with like changes in all legislation introduced in this Session of the Legislature. The word "Ordinance", wherever it appears in the *Liquor Ordinance* has been replaced by the word "Act". "Commissioner" is replaced by the word "Commissioner in Executive Council", as are other changes of a similar nature relative to our recent legislature evolution.

Section 103 of the *Liquor Act* now provides the discretion of the municipalities and local improvement districts to request prohibition of public drinking by resolution within their boundaries. However, the present section also now defines those areas, such as public parks, where public drinking is allowed, and does not allow for the inclusion of a specific area by the Council of Local Improvement Districts in order to prohibit public drinking in that problem area.

The elected officials at the municipal level simply do not presently have the authority to alter public drinking prohibition according to the community's individual needs. There appears to be a problem with public drinking in Rotary Park. At the same time, this Government does not want to arbitrarily extend the prohibition to Rotary Park as it would automatically do the same in communities where public drinking in their parks is not a problem.

Furthermore, the City Council, which has other responsibilities regarding public drinking in Whitehorse should have the right to review this problem. Other communities might wish to move in a similar manner with regard to a specific area within their boundaries.

We have therefore produced this legislation in such a manner that each individual community, whether it now prohibits drinking or not, will have the opportunity to move according to that community's needs.

²⁴ Once more we are providing a means by which responsible and particular needs are dealt with at the same level. This Act also provides for the inclusion of the word "hamlet" which will become a legal entity when the new *Municipal Act* comes into force. This means that the portion of this referring to the term "hamlet", will now come into force only when that occurs.

Mr. Kimmerly: It also gives me very great pleasure to speak to this Bill. This is a very good bill and we support it wholeheartedly. The principle of local control of public drinking is an important one and we congratulate the Government for recognizing that principle in the law and extending it, such as this Bill does, to individual areas within a municipality, for example, the beaches and parks. It is a forward measure. It is a measure desired, I am sure, by all municipalities and all regional governments in Yukon. The principle of local consultation and local control is gradually being recognized by the Government, and we congratulate the Government for that.

This is probably not the most important amendment to the *Liquor Act* necessarily, however, it is a valuable one. We welcome it and are even thankful that it comes before the summer.

Mr. Veale: We agree, in principle, with this piece of legislation and we are amazed at how it is being accepted in this House, considering the wild debate we had some time last week over a Notice of Motion. It is nice to see the House acting in consensus.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 4: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third Reading, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 4 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 4 be read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title of the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 4 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 4 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 7: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 7, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works, that Bill No. 7 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works, that Bill No. 7 be now read a third time.

Mr. Penikett: We will support the Bill at third reading without objection.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title of the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 7 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 7 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 29: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 29, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 29 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 29 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title of the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 29 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Public Works that Bill No. 29 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 22: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 22, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Tracey.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo that Bill No. 22 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo that Bill No. 22 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member

for Mayo that Bill No. 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Justice, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo that Bill No. 22 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 17: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 17, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 17 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 17 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 17 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Justice that Bill No. 17 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 18: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 18 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 18 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 18 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources that Bill No. 18 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 12: Third Reading

Mr. Clerk: Third reading, Bill No. 12, standing in the name of the Honourable Mrs. McCall.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Bill No. 12 be now read a third time.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Bill No. 12 be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: Are you prepared to adopt the title to the Bill?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Bill No. 12 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and Human Resources, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Bill No. 12 do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: May I have your further pleasure at this time?

Mr. Graham: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House dissolve into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Campbell that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House dissolve into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: We will be going into Bill No. 11, and presumably after that we would go back to Bill No. 5, after a brief recess.

Mr. Penikett: I understood that we are to do Bill No. 5. Can I be perfectly clear that we are not doing Bill No. 6 today, but we are doing Bill No. 11 then Bill No. 5?

Mr. Speaker: We are doing Bill No. 11 but I will check during recess on the other one.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We will proceed with Bill No. 11, *Seniors' Income Supplement Act*.

Bill No. 11

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Just to give a small outline again of the Income Supplement Program for seniors, this Act will provide low-income senior citizens who are in receipt of the guaranteed income supplement or spouse's allowance with a maximum supplementary income payment of up to \$100 a month on a sliding scale in order to establish a minimum Yukon guaranteed level of income above the Federal level of guarantee.

This program will therefore guarantee basis income adequacy to all eligible senior citizens reflective of local cost and need in Yukon. It is projected the program will cost about \$300,000 and will deliver income supplement benefits to 378 senior citizens in Yukon each month. The administrative dimensions of the program have been kept simple utilizing existing person-years both within Health and Human Resources and Finance in order to ensure maximum benefits are delivered to the beneficiaries.

Each eligible senior citizen will receive a monthly cheque from the Government of Yukon and will be automatically registered for this benefit once their eligibility for the guaranteed income supplement or spouses' allowance has been established.

Mr. Kimmerly: It is an excellent Bill and we will generally be supporting it. Our only questions will be on the specific amounts and a few minor details.

On Clause 1

Clause 1 agreed to

On Clause 2

Clause 2 agreed to

On Clause 3

Clause 3 agreed to

On Clause 4

Mr. Kimmerly: The Minister knows precisely the number of recipients, 378, and I would ask if the figure of \$100 was chosen for a general budgetary reason or because of a specific Yukon cost-of-living indicator?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not think that there was a formula worked out with Finance. I think that it was the same as the formula for the Pioneer Utility Grant. It was a sum that would be a helpful amount and make some difference in the life of that person. I think that the cost-of-living increases and so on were also taken into consideration. I do not know that there was a very scientific explanation of why it is exactly \$100, but it was well considered and this was the sum arrived at.

Mr. Kimmerly: There is a graduating scale up to the maximum. Was there any calculation made as to the administration expense of utilizing the sliding scale as opposed to paying all senior citizens the \$100?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I think that that was considered and that the cost was miniscule.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister say how much a senior citizen is going to be receiving on the basis of the calculations in 4(1)(a) and 4(1)(b)?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The basic amount that a single pensioner would get, with the Old-Age Security Pension, would be \$227.73. The Guaranteed Income Supplement of \$228.63. This is the minimum income that a senior could have. It would allow the payment of \$100 of the Yukon Supplement to be paid. That would be a total monthly income of \$556.36, which is not a princely sum but they would be better off than seniors in other parts of Canada who are right down to the basic income.

The basic old-age security pension for married couples is \$455.46. The Guaranteed Income Supplement, therefore, would be \$352.54. In the absence of any other income, there would be \$100 for each of the pensioners.

Mr. Veale: \$200 is being added to \$455.56 for the individual one?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes. Making a total of \$1,1008: \$455.46 basic, \$352.54 Guaranteed Income Supplement and \$200 for the Yukon Supplement, making a total of \$1,008.00.

Mr. Veale: The total for the single person was \$556.36 was it?

27 Clause 4 agreed to

On Clause 5

Mr. Veale: Clause 5(3) has a one year limitation to it. I am not clear on why a one year would be accepted. Presumably there could be things that could be discovered years later, for example. Would not that be a limitation on recovery that would be rather restrictive rather than broad?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: It is a point, I suppose. It is not the sort of pension that is misused, I do not think. The time of one year was something that was arrived at after some thought. It seemed to be a reasonable thing. These are seniors.

Mr. Veale: When they are abused, generally speaking, they are not seniors. We are talking now about abuse, about someone who should not be getting it but who is going to be receiving it. What you are saying is that if a person does it for a number of years, and then stops, and then there is a certain time period before it is discovered, and a year has gone by, then that is the end of the recovery.

Hon. Mr. Tracey: I think if we read number three, it says if it is willful it can be commenced at any time. If it is not, then one year is the limitation.

Clause 5 agreed to

On Clause 6

Clause 6 agreed to

On Clause 7

Clause 7 agreed to

29 On Clause 8

Clause 8 agreed to

On Clause 9

Clause 9 agreed to

On Clause 10

Clause 10 agreed to

On Clause 11

Mr. Kimmerly: I wonder if the postponement of this Bill to July 1st indicates a fall election?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I could not answer that for the world.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: The reason for the July 1st date is that we felt for budgeting purposes we should know exactly how much money we anticipated spending during the course of the year.

Mr. Hanson: I, on behalf of myself and Mr. Chairman and the Minister of Municipal Affairs would like to thank the Members of this House very much for their contribution.

Mr. Penikett: I assume the three Members who have just been identified will be declaring their conflict and not voting on this measure.

Clause 11 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Are you prepared to carry the title of Bill No. 11, *Seniors' Income Supplement Act*?

Title agreed to

Bill No. 11 agreed to

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I move that Bill No. 11, *Seniors' Income Supplement Act* be moved out of Committee without amendment.

Motion agreed to

Bill No. 5

Mr. Chairman: We will now turn to Bill No. 5, on Page 232, Department of Renewable Resources, a total of \$3,928,000. Is there general discussion?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Deputy Minister for the department is on his way in. I have some comments I would like to make in respect of the Main Estimates. It indicates a decrease which is due to the fact that the responsibility for the rental of accommodations has been transferred to Government Services. I am going on memory, but I believe that amount is in the area of \$250,000. Along with that, there has been a restructuring within the department, which was announced some time ago, and the Budget does reflect that restructuring which will allow us, I believe, to have a much more efficient operation as far as responsibilities are concerned. That is mainly in the area of law enforcement with the Conservation Officers.

There has been a tendency for the department to run approximately \$100,000 in the area of overtime. We are tightening up in our administration similar to the recommendations that were put forward by the Public Accounts Committee. We will be utilizing, as a resource, the Auxiliary Conservation Officer Program, which is coming into effect. There seems to be a fair amount of public interest in this area. I am confident that in most communities we will be able to attract people who are prepared to take a 14-hour course and be prepared to be called out over the course of the year to help with enforcement.

³¹ As far as the department is concerned, the budget has been revised somewhat as compared to last year's. It is very difficult to compare it except for the bottom line as far as financial expenditure is concerned. Subsequently, it is going to be very difficult to relate the two-line items in view of the restructuring within the department.

Along that line, I should point out that I think the department should be given a fair amount of credit in respect to the work that they have been doing in public relations, for example, the hunter-trapper calendar, the hunter safety training manual has been developed. Also, the audio-visuals that have been developed. We just had one completed here about a week ago and it was very well received. It will be getting a fair amount of exposure throughout the Territory. As you know, we also received a hunter opinion survey, which does give us some indication from those people who have harvested a game as to what their opinions are as far as laws are concerned.

Along with that, we have been working closely for the purpose of an agricultural policy for Yukon. Over the course of the past year, Members are aware, we developed the new *Wildlife Ordinance* as well as outfitter policy and it has been very time-consuming for the department and the management of the department, along with the administration of the various functions of the department, such as campgrounds — and the list goes on.

In my estimation, within the financial framework that we must work in, I think the department has done a very good job and we have some very dedicated within the department.

I would also point out that coming up this year, in the area of research and planning, we will have various appropriate maps and reports available as far as the MacMillan Pass area is concerned. On the Dempster Highway management plan, various recommendations will be sent forward to the Government. The East Kluane Land Use Plan will be pretty well completed and available for the public to review. At the same time, there will be a fair amount of work done on the Ibex area.

In the area of game management, we will be continuing to review inventory of our birds. Also, continued efforts will be related to falcon breeding and reintroduction, along with development of species management plans for the inventory of fur-bearing animals.

The Trapper Education Program will continue and, as I indicated, we are very pleased with the results of the initiatives we are taking with the Yukon Trappers Association and the success we have met with over the course of this past year. We will continue with our trap-line administration.

We will be continuing in the big game management area, with

inventories in those areas that are under resident and non-resident hunting pressures close to communities. For an example, we have completed a moose inventory between here and the Kluane area. That information is being tabulated at the present time. I think it is fair to say that there is being concern expressed by the Biology Department that the moose in the area do not seem to be propagating in the numbers that they should be, and regulations will be put before Cabinet in the very near future to discuss this. I will be proposing that over the course of this year, that there be no antlerless moose season in this particular area.

³² We will be continuing sheep and goat inventories relative to the Game Management Zones. Also we will be continuing monitoring of the porcupine caribou herd and development of various management plans in that area. Also we will be doing further work respecting the woodland caribou populations in the Territory.

At the same time we are in the process of putting into effect a grizzly bear management plan for Yukon and I hope to have a fair amount of public debate over the course of this year on what I feel very strongly has to be assessed and put into place.

In the area of parks and outdoor recreation, we will be continuing with inventory and evaluation of the geographic areas in Yukon relative to the features that could be suitable for the establishment of future Territorial parks. Also there will be development of site plans as the basis for the construction and rehabilitation of recreation areas and campgrounds.

I think that largely covers, in a general sense, the department. As you know, as a Government we have highlighted this department from a financial point of view over the course of the last three and a half years. I recognize the financial amount is not a major increase over the past year. I think it will allow, more or less, for us to continue on as we have in the past. We will be able to allow, with the reorganization and increase efficiency that we feel we can get through the reorganization, to take a much broader perspective as far as the Territory as a whole is concerned.

Mr. Veale: It is nice to have an opportunity to debate the Budget for what some people are calling now the Department of Agriculture. I do not say that that is completely unjust because there is a great deal of concern about how the two policies, the Wildlife Policy and the Agriculture Policy, are going to be administered and what is going to be the upshot from the introduction of the Agricultural Policy over a period of 10 or 15 years.

The report that was prepared by Mr. Lortie set out some very real concerns, concerns which I hope will be addressed in the Agricultural Policy when it is brought forward in this Session. It may perhaps be a situation where the two policies, Wildlife Policy and a Conservation Policy, can proceed hand in hand with an agricultural policy, and no one be the loser as a result. The real fear is that we will be substituting the cheapest source of protein that we have in this country — virtually that of moose meat — for expensive and costly production of red beef meat. That would be a truly sad situation.

The report entitled "Towards the Future for Yukon Wildlife, 1978-87", was an important document that has not really been brought forward until recently. It was a very unfortunate thing, because had that document been brought out at the time that it was prepared, it would have stimulated public debate in the Yukon on our most important asset and our most important area of jurisdiction, wildlife.

³³ I would like to quote what I consider to be probably the most telling criticism that was in that report, and it was made some time ago. One can stand up and say that that was made in the past and we have done all this since then, but, I really wonder how much has changed and whether or not we have gained at all. Page 287 states that, "as outlined in other sections of this report, these additions in staff and increases in operation money are necessary to catch up to the Canadian provinces in game management, which are, at this time, at least 20 years ahead of us in their knowledge about their wildlife resource and in their means of implementing and enforcing proper wildlife management techniques". That was also saying, of course, that we were 20 years behind the provinces and that is a matter of very serious concern, considering that our wildlife is our most important renewable asset and an extremely important recreation asset. I would say, even more than that, the food value of our wildlife is probably one of the key issues as the

cost-of-living in this Territory increases.

The point that was made in the report was that if there were not additions to staff made at that time, and over the ten-year plan put forward in that report, the Territory would essentially remain 20 years behind the times. I put that to the Minister. Has the Territory remained 20 years behind the provinces in their assessment, knowledge of wildlife and in their means of implementing and enforcing wildlife management techniques?

The situation, as I understand it, is that this Territory is still, after four years, in a position of just accumulating the data. I am glad the Minister is getting lots of advice from Mr. Falle because he probably has some good ideas on what to do about it. The real issue is, are we still at the stage where we are accumulating the data in order to come to management conclusions?

I was really pleased to hear the Minister say that he is not in favour of having the antlerless moose season in the particular area to the west of Whitehorse going through to Kluane, because that indicates that we have actually taken the first step, in that particular area, to do the kind of wildlife management that has been required over the past four years.

The other area that the report brought out is that the Northwest Territories — this is on Page 260 in case the Minister is interested — has 46 Fish and Wildlife Officers and the Yukon has nine. That was stated at the time the report was done. It basically produces a ratio of population to wildlife resources that was substantially different in the two territories.

4 To some extent, that can be explained in terms of the distances involved in the Northwest Territories and, perhaps they need more people to cover the great distances. The point being made in the report, which was prepared by Government staff — this was not some document prepared by someone who did not know what he was talking about, it was prepared by the experts — was that without a substantial increase in staff and the support mechanisms that the gap between wildlife management in the Yukon and wildlife management in the provinces would remain the same or increase. That gets down to very important issues such as the amount of aircraft time that are provided to biologists to do the kind of work that is required, and the amount of aircraft time that is provided by the department for enforcement. I think that those are absolutely and completely inadequate at this time to do a proper management job for our most valuable resource.

The response of the Minister, in the last six months, has been two-fold. One, he has announced what was designated as a major reorganization. What they did was move a bunch of people around the department, but the reorganization was something that was sheer window dressing, because the lines of communication between the wildlife officers and the biologists, the people who have that knowledge, were really blurred or made negative essentially by that reorganization. So the reorganization was not a success in any sense of the word.

The Auxiliary Conservation Officer Program, of course, is a method of meeting the objective of that 1978 report and increasing staff and so on. I am pleased to see that there is going to be public education and so on, but the Auxiliary Conservation Officer Program has down sides to it and they have been expressed by a number of people, such as how difficult it is for the local officer to enforce against his friendly neighbour in a small town and, of course, it allows the community to keep excellent tabs on where the conservation officer is because he will set it up so that he will be going to a particular place with the auxiliary conservation officer.

Those are issues that I think really have to be dealt with. I think the Minister has to acknowledge that he is really just taking steps that are virtually a drop in the bucket and the essential criticism that was made in the 1978 report remains valid.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The way the Member speaks, perhaps we could have experts just develop various reports and then, the way the Member puts it, he would accept them *verbatim*, and go ahead accordingly. I think there are a number of things that should be corrected in respect to comparing ourselves to the NWT. I recognize the Member opposite would like to refer to Yukon as Northern Canada as opposed to a separate identity.

35 Yukon does have approximately one-twentieth of the land mass. I should point out, in comparison to the Northwest Territories, their

laws are much different than those of Yukon. You are allowed to commercially sell wild meat. There is definitely a greater segment of the population that have the ability to hunt 365 days a year without any limitations of any kind — that are presently federal statutes — which obviously are going to have an effect as far as land management is concerned.

The Member opposite says to me that we should not be developing an agricultural policy. He says that...

Mr. Veale: Point of order. The Member opposite made no such statement.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Every inference was made to that extent. Perhaps he is a little worried politically and he is not prepared to come up front and say it.

The point is that we do have a major problem in areas as I indicated as far as the moose population is concerned and the harvesting pressures that have been put on it, for example between here and Kluane. It is a very real fact. Subsequently we are going to have to start managing our herds and our harvest accordingly.

There are a number of things that I think can be done, looking into the future. We are going to have to work closely with Forestry. We are going to be looking at this area in specifics this year as to what the predators are taking as far as the moose population is concerned, and whether or not any controlling factor will have to be put into that element of the game management. Also we are looking at the possibility of controlled burns, as I indicated, will require Forestry, which is under the Federal Government's auspices, to co-operate with us to see whether or not we could revitalize areas for better moose habitat, and subsequently increase the number of moose in certain areas.

The other point I would like to make is that the Member says we are twenty years behind because he read a statement to that effect, since that document was written, there have been major strides made, such as headquarters for various staff in Dawson City, Haines Junction, Watson Lake and Ross River. Along with that there has been the supporting infrastructure, such as vehicles and various equipment that is necessary for running their everyday responsibilities. That has been a step forward.

I disagree totally that we are twenty years behind anybody. I am not saying improvements cannot be made and we have been making improvements. I have to give the opposition their credit, they have been part of the *Wildlife Ordinance*. It has been a major improvement and it has given the legislative base for people to work within in 1982 terms as opposed to when the original piece of legislation was passed approximately 10 years ago.

If one compared our game management and our ability to effectively manage our game, one should only have a look at 10 or 15 years ago when there was only one or two people in the department. That was the Department of Wildlife.

36 We are up to the area of 69 staff, working with various elements in respect to that responsibility. There has been a major commitment by the taxpayer in this area and I do not think we should downgrade that commitment. I am not saying that down the road it may well necessitate further increases in this area.

Further to that, the Member opposite talks about aircraft time. I am just going on memory now, and I believe we have in the area of \$500,000 projected for aircraft time. I have also met with the Outfitters Association and they have agreed that they are prepared to take biologists out over the course of the summer months in some of the areas that we are going to have a look at. The biologists feel that this is a good move in the right direction. Just flying around in a helicopter does not necessarily give you all the answers. They will have the ability of covering a fairly large land mass and have an evaluation as far as the ground and habitat are concerned. I think it is a plus for everybody involved and it is going to cost a minimal amount of money.

I disagree with the Member opposite. I recognize he has problems trying to find things to be critical about in the Budget. I recognize that he was a member of various organizations in town and he probably would say that people should not harvest game. I think it can be done and done compatibly. From my perspective, I think we are proceeding in that middle ground area which is necessary in this area of responsibility and I think we are doing it effectively.

Mr. Veale: Just for the record, my interest is in having wildlife to

harvest. If the trend that is taking place in the Yukon continues, there is not going to be wildlife to harvest at future dates. All you have to do is go and look around other areas of the country and see what is happening in western Canada and you will realize that your own people in your own department make the same statement. It is a downhill trend. That is the trend that has to be reversed.

I think that the people in the department, the biologists with the knowledge and the information — and we have some of the best trained biologists in the world, and I do not hesitate to say that for a minute — should be listened to. The Government Leader has stated it correctly. In 1978, when they came forward and made that statement you should have listened. You should have made the report public and you should have lobbied to have more funds put into wildlife conservation.

Instead, the report was just put on the table and has collected dust, instead of being used as a document for a public discussion, which would have really been to the advantage of every Yukoner.

There is one point that the Minister made which I would ask him to elaborate on. I think it is an area that is worthwhile to consider. That is the moose control berms. Would he elaborate on what the long-term policy is going to be with respect to that issue?

³⁷ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** Once again I throw out some ideas that I have just discussed with the Biology staff. They are working with Forestry. Once it gets to the point that a policy decision has to be made, it will be coming through the Deputy Minister to Cabinet to have a look at. It is strictly in the formative stages. I am encouraging them to come forward so that we can have a look at. So, again, I give him some information and all of a sudden the Member opposite accuses me of not having a policy. Yesterday, I was accused because I did not have a policy within two hours of a Federal Government announcement. Then the Members opposite wonder why I do not want to table something until a policy decision has been made. I am very pleased to see the *Freedom of Information Act* before us saying that draft policy would not be discussed.

Mr. Kimmerly: I have a series of questions around two central issues. The questions are obviously relevant in general debate. The first one is about the value of wildlife or the value of Yukon's wildlife.

A number of outfitters spoke to the Select Committee on the *Wildlife Ordinance* in the last Session about the undervaluation of wildlife in that the value of a dahl ram is probably in excess of \$10,000 in that the value to the tourism industry and the value to the outfitter adds up to a very large figure. Some Yukoners probably take the right to take game as a right. It is relatively cheap in that game is free. You go out and get it. That is obviously not the case. There is a trade-off between development in certain areas and protection of wildlife.

Is the policy of the department moving in the direction of attempting to fix a monetary value on wildlife in terms of individual animals or in terms of value to the economy of wildlife?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is a very difficult question to answer. I would say, for the record, that I got lost in the exchange that we had earlier. I want to inform the Member from Whitehorse South Centre that I have every intention of going salmon fishing this fall. If he wants the dates of my leaving and coming back, I will be more than happy to provide them at a later date. I should point out for the information of the House that I am very unhappy, as I did miss my annual Dolly Varden trip. I understand they were there in great numbers, even up to the size of six pounds. I would like to impress upon Members that I take my public service very seriously.

³⁸ In respect to the value of wildlife, and the Member opposite refers to it in respect to the public of the public of the Yukon Territory as free, I cannot totally accept that analysis. Perhaps the Member opposite does not go out with the purpose of harvesting game, which is his privilege. The point being is that I, as an individual in the Yukon, have lived here twelve months a year and pay my fuel bill twelve months a year and put up with conditions much more severe than in other parts of the country.

One of the reasons, and I think I can speak for a lot of people in the Territory, is the recreation value that we see of the Territory and the relatively free ability that we have under the regulations and the laws that are set by this House, to go and harvest, for the purposes of not only the meat that is brought in, but also for the recreation it provides.

From my perspective, if the Member opposite is intimating that we should be charging people in the Territory, say up to \$10,000, for the purposes of harvesting a sheep or moose, I cannot accept that. I do not think that there is any argument from this side of the House that the person has a responsibility to pay a certain amount of dollars for the right to go out hunting and we charge that.

There is no question that we put a value on the wildlife. I think it reflects in our \$4 million that obviously we do. Otherwise, if we did not feel that the wildlife in the Territory was of any value, I do not think we would need to hire a Deputy Minister and the staff that is associated with the responsibilities that we feel we should be assuming. From my perspective, I think that we are doing a pretty fair job in respect to our responsibilities with industry. We do work with industry. For example, with Cyprus Anvil we are in the process of studying the sheep population there and what effect expansion will have, on a cost-shared basis. We have cost-shared various studies in the MacPass area and in the Bonnet Plume area with industry. There is definitely a value we attach with it and we feel that this analysis and look at the areas that could be developed, we have a responsibility of going to see what the populations are and look at the best ways that access could be made into an area without interfering with wildlife or the propagation thereof.

There are decisions that have to be made and the Member opposite may not agree with me. There has to be a common ground. This side of the House is development-minded. There is no question of that. We also recognize the value of our wildlife and I think you can see that priority over the last four years as far as the amount of dollars we have spent in this area, coming up with the various inventories as well as financial resources to go about the job that we feel should be done.

³⁹ **Mr. Kimmerly:** There is very probably some misunderstanding of attitudes. I want to make it very clear that I do not take issue with what the Minister just said and I want to clearly state that I basically agree with the speech that he just made. We are not advocating an increased charge, and especially an increased charge to Yukoners, for the right to hunt. We are not advocating that. The direction that I wish to go is that the right to hunt and the recreation value is a very significant thing. Some Yukoners, and I do not wish to imply all Yukoners, or even the majority of Yukoners, do not realize just what a significant thing it is. It is a very valuable thing and the import of my questions is to do my bit to ensure that it continues for as long as possible.

It is obvious that, in the very developed areas of this country, in the big cities, wildlife has basically disappeared. The only point that I am making is that the managers of the economy and the managers of the development projects in the Yukon talk in terms of dollars, in terms of a product. The value of Yukon's wildlife ought to be adequately established and even though it is often primarily a recreation value that many Yukoners are looking to, there ought to be a notional dollar value put on that factor, not for the purpose of charging for it. There are still things in life which are free or untaxed, and that the Government does not unduly interfere with.

It is extremely valuable, in the sense of the inventories that are being collected now, and it is extremely valuable in assessing the value to Yukoners of, for example, maintaining a wildlife habitat. There should be an economic value placed on that and a notional dollar figure. I am asking if the policy of the department is to, as well as collect inventories, to place an economic value on the wildlife resource in general?

⁴⁰ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I would hesitate very much to say that a moose is worth this and a sheep is worth this because the Member opposite would say either too low or too high. We recognize there is a value to our wildlife, otherwise we would not have a Department of Renewable Resources responsible for that area. We reflect that with taxpayers' dollars in respect to administering and carrying out the responsibilities that are vested through legislation by this House. Therefore there is definitely a dollar value, if you like, on wildlife, because we have highlighted it in every Budget we have presented within the financial framework and the limitations we have to work in as a total Government and our ability to raise revenue.

The Member opposite says to me that he basically agrees with my previous statement. I recognize, for example, you have a nominated

candidate in Hootalinqua who probably disagreed violently with what I said. I have seen some of his editorials. I have seen some of his public statements in the area of wildlife. In fact, he tried to sell me a membership to Green Peace and I, philosophically, am opposed to Green Peace.

I do not know if the Member opposite is speaking for his Party or what, but there is definitely a philosophical difference within the membership. That is fine and that is what parties are there for - to work out these differences.

All I can say is that yes, there is a value to wildlife. I am not prepared to stand here and say, "if you shoot a moose, we will let you sell it for 600 bucks". We do, as far as trophy fees are concerned, add a fair charge. There is a value to that aspect of the resource directly providing revenue to the Government.

Mr. Kimmerly: I regret to say that I can only agree with some of things the Minister just said. In last year's Budget there was a discussion about an enforcement officer or a conservation officer in Old Crow. It was also mentioned in the Throne Speech. Would the Minister inform us if an enforcement officer will be placed in Old Crow and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The position is in the Budget. We did have a fire and accommodations were lacking. The idea was to build the necessary accommodations for the conservation officer. The idea was that the conservation officer would travel between Dawson, Old Crow, Eagle Plains, and in that area. It would not necessarily be a sedentary position. It would be a question of moving throughout the area. Our plans are to be going ahead with that this year, at least to a certain degree.

⁴¹ **Mr. Kimmerly:** My next question is in the same general area of enforcement. The social scientists who study the criminal justice system have fairly definitely and clearly made a statement that the size of penalty for an offence is not as good a deterrent as is the likelihood of apprehension. To phrase that a different way, the possibility of being caught is a greater deterrent than the jail term, the fine or the penalty. In the wildlife area this, of course, is a problem. The very nature of the activity is done out in the bush away from other people. The necessity for vigilant enforcement is therefore increased. Is the Minister satisfied with the general level of enforcement? I do not mean the competence of officers, I mean the number of wildlife officers. Is there a plan to gradually, over the next five or ten years, increase the number of wildlife officers or decrease them, or maintain approximately the same service?

Hon. Mr. Lang: In respect to the legislation, I think the penalty sections that we incorporated into the legislation do act as a deterrent. The Member opposite may not agree. It is fair to say that increases in our penalty sections were incorporated in the legislation. We did not feel that the judicial system was taking it as seriously as we felt it should. We felt that infractions against the law that were enacted in this House should be dealt with accordingly.

I think we intend to keep the present staff the same size. As I have indicated to Members opposite, we have incorporated our auxiliary conservation officer program. I feel that will help to some degree. I think the other key is that we are working at it in the Education Department through the school system, impressing upon the students the importance of wildlife and the responsibilities they have as individuals. We can make all the laws in the world, but if the majority of us do not have respect for the resource that we are making the laws for then they are not of much value. I think we are proceeding satisfactorily. I am not saying it cannot be stepped up over the course of the next few years.

⁴² **Mr. Kimmerly:** On the same general topic, is there any plan within the department to try and get Native conservative officers or as many as possible over the next, say, five or ten years?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes, we would like to see the Native people more involved in this area. It has been a subject of discussion at the Land Claims negotiations. Depending on our financial situation, I would like to think that we can get a number of them involved that are interested. I think it is important from their point of view as well as ours.

I would like to see a course of that kind open to everyone in the Territory but I think we are going to have to put special emphasis on the

young Native people who would like to be involved as well. I think we are going to find over the course of the next 10 years, with our school population being what it is and it is become more stabilized, that we are going to have more and more kids who have been raised here and perhaps educated outside with one to three years of university, coming back to take on these responsibilities as time goes on.

Mr. Kimmerly: On the issue of Native involvement, everyone knows that an agreement-in-principle with regard to wildlife has already been reached at the negotiating table. Is that agreement-in-principle being developed or implemented by the department or is the planning for the development and implementation of that being done? What are the budgetary implications of that planning?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is all subject to final agreement, as the Member opposite fully knows, not only in his capacity as a Member but, as I understand, in his capacity as a lawyer. He has knowledge, perhaps to more of an extent than I have, in view of who his partners are as well.

The information that has been made public, as you know, was generated largely on the assistance of the Government along with the Council for Yukon Indians. We have been exploring various areas of how we could implement these things. We are also looking at the financial implications. A lot is going to depend on the Government of Canada which has special responsibilities and what financial obligations they are prepared to assume. I do not have the figures with me and if I did, I do not think I would tell the Member opposite at this time.

Mr. Kimmerly: The Minister stated that he was looking at the financial implications although he does not know the figures. Can the Minister give us a general idea of what the budget implications are this year, 1982-83?

⁴³ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** The budget implications are that unless we get a final agreement and the Government of Canada in the middle of the year, then there would be a supplementary. It is all if's and maybe's. We could not base this budget on hypothesis.

Mr. Kimmerly: In the agreement-in-principle or the partial agreement, I understand that it was made public that there was a training component of some sort. Is that training component going to be implemented before the final agreement, or is it going to wait until the final agreement?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The possibility does exist. Perhaps it could be done simultaneously.

On Administration

Mr. Chairman: Turn to Page 234. Administration in the amount of \$543,000. General discussion.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think it was fairly clear that this has to do with the administration and it does reflect the reorganization of the department. I think it is fair to say that we are putting into effect many of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee that were recommended in respect to the financial procedures. I am hopeful that those will be put into effect and implemented over the course of the next two to three months. There has been an awful lot of work done in the department in this area as far as financial control is concerned. I am sure Members opposite, or at least on this side of the House, will be happy to know that.

I think it is fairly clear what this consists of. It is nine people within the administration and it reflects basically what I indicated earlier.

Mr. Veale: There is another line item for resource management in administration. Would the Minister explain why that is put in as a separate line item? Or is it, in fact, included in this \$543,000?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is a separate item in that branch. There are a number of expenditures here in this area. Roughly \$300,000 is for personnel. The major expenditures there would be \$50,000 for our share of the Yukon River Basin agreement, depending on how that goes, but we are projecting \$50,000. There are also the expenses of the Wildlife Advisory Committee as well as the Agricultural Development Council.

⁴⁴ Depending on how things go with the agricultural development council, \$20,000; the Wildlife Advisory Council, since we have the *Wildlife Ordinance* in place, we are expecting in the area of \$10,000 as our expenditure in that area; printing of seals and that type of thing, permits and licences, is \$23,000 and office supplies, stationery, et cetera, \$25,000. The major expenditure is the Yukon River Basin

Agreement, as well as the costs of the various committees and councils that we have set up.

Mr. Veale: Just on the Wildlife Advisory Council receiving \$10,000, could the Minister indicate what the allocation was last year? It seems to me that there is going to be a tremendous increase in the Wildlife Advisory Council work under the new ordinance. I would like to know if it is going to be a sufficient allocation? It is a fairly big board as I recall.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It was about \$8,500 last year and, over and above that, we spent about \$6,000 for that tour that we did of the northern Yukon, which I took the Wildlife Advisory Council on last spring. The other point that I should make is that, no, I do not agree with the Member opposite that they will be forced to sit that often. We have a number of policies that we want them to review but, as I say, the regulations have been gone through for the course of this year. They will be discussed here in the very near future by Cabinet. Once a decision has been made, you will be notified. There are a number of other issues that are coming up that they will be looking at but I cannot see them meeting that often. Maybe once or twice this spring and once or twice in the fall.

Mr. Veale: On the Agricultural Development Council for \$20,000, what are the number of applications that are anticipated? Is some of that work now done in terms of the actual policy development, or is that simply the sitting time to address applications?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is largely for the policy aspects that they are going to have to consider. Once we get into the position that they are reviewing applications, I do not expect it to be sitting that often. We are just trying to project. It is very difficult for us at the present time. As far as applications are concerned, application forms are being printed, as I indicated during Question Period, and they will be put out and then we will have some feeling of just exactly how many people are serious about becoming involved in the agricultural industry. I think sometimes that it is getting blown out of proportion. Only time will tell.

Administration in the amount of \$543,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: I think that Committee will have a brief recess for a wake-up pill and a cup of coffee.

Recess

⁴⁵ **Mr. Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order.

Hon. Mr. Lang: The Member for Kluane wanted to say a few words earlier and was not able to get your attention. Perhaps you could give her the floor for a moment.

Mrs. McGuire: I have a question on Administration but I want as well to compliment the Minister on one of the things he has come up with, the possible plan to not harvest antlerless moose in order to allow the moose population to rebuild, and I believe he included Kluane.

I also want to throw out another idea to the Minister where possibly he could have his department consider a regulation which would not permit the harvesting of yearling moose. That is one of things I have not heard come up in the House today. Hunters prefer a young moose rather than an older moose. Yearling moose are very easy to identify. Naturally, when they harvest smaller moose, it is not enough meat for the household, therefore, other members in the family harvest another moose. I would like to see some kind of consideration in that area where yearling moose would come under a regulation of non-harvesting.

Is the Wildlife Department short of staff? I want to know in what other areas is there a decline in the moose population?

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. McGuire, we have gone through general discussion on the department.

Mrs. McGuire: That is a question.

Mr. Chairman: We are doing Policy and Information now, but there will be opportunity later.

On Policy and Information

⁴⁶ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** It reflects the importance that we have put on the area of information and education and I have touched on in general debate. I feel that it should be an ongoing responsibility of the department. Also, a new line item is Computer Services. We are in the

process of getting our own computer. This will allow us to do a lot of our own analysis here. Up to date we have had to utilize the University of British Columbia for both our land use inventory that we have been doing as well as our wildlife inventory that we have been taking in, to compile the necessary information on computers. That cost now will be spent here in Yukon as opposed to outside.

Our Policy Legislation reflects the staff that we have on for the purposes of developing policies in the various areas that we feel should be looked at. Basically this item here is a combination largely of salaries, and the other costs, as I indicated, are for computer services et cetera.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate, aside from the computer services aspect, what that line item would have been in the past so that we can compare whether it is an increase or a decrease?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I did not have that specifically identified. It is fair to say that we had the same salary as we did last year with whatever increase that would be put onto it this year. Along with that we had a certain amount of travel expenses that were required to necessitate the individual going outside to utilize the computers in the University of British Columbia. I do not have the figures directly with me in that comparison.

Mr. Veale: Does the Minister have the figures for going on to Computer Services? What is the cost going to be to go on to the computer?

Hon. Mr. Lang: The cost of the Computer Services is going to be in the range of \$13,000.

On Information-Education

Mr. Chairman: Information-Education, \$76,000.

Information-Education in the amount of \$76,000 agreed to
On Computer Services

Mr. Chairman: Computer Services, \$53,000.

Computer Services in the amount of \$53,000 agreed to
On Policy Legislation

Mr. Chairman: Policy Legislation, \$48,000.

Policy Legislation in the amount of \$48,000 agreed to
Policy and Information in the amount of \$177,000 agreed to

On Resource Planning and Management

Mr. Chairman: Page 238. I think this is the opportunity for you, Mrs. McGuire, to get all of those questions you wish answered here.

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is largely the area of the biology side of the department. In the most part, it is confined to the area of resource management in the area of administration as well as research and planning, for example, inventories. Further to that you will notice that there is a differentiation between small game management and big game management. Also there are provisions for parks and outdoor recreation, and that is largely to do with planning.

It is largely a salary component within the Department. You will see some statistics as far as harvest is concerned. Further, in respect to the moose population, I think it is fair to say that there are some regulations to in some areas of Yukon, such as in the Mayo-Stewart area, which will probably continue for one more year.

⁴⁷ As far as other inventories being down or up, it is hard to say at the present time. There has definitely been, in the last couple of years, more direction to those areas that are under a fair amount of harvest pressure from residents. From appearances at the present time we are having a problem with predators as well, and we are looking at that. As far as the departmental staff, it would be nice to have more but that is all that we can have within the financial limitations that we are working within.

Mr. Penikett: I do not know whether it is the right place to point it out, but I notice on Page 237 that there is reference to an audio-visual entitled "Doll Sheep — How to recognize a full curl". I assume that is in reference to a living doll, but the word "doll" may be spelled incorrectly.

Hon. Mr. Lang: Point of order. The Member is probably grammatically correct and perhaps it should be altered. I just would like to point out to the Member that we are on Page 238. We have cleared that section.

Mr. Penikett: On the same point of order. I have such high respect and high regard for the Minister and his budget that I would not

want a tragic error like that to remain in such an important document. It was only my effort to improve the integrity of the document that caused me to stand at all.

Mr. Veale: Because this is a new breakdown that was not done before, what are the allocations that were done previously in terms of putting money into small game and big game management? The budget was not allocated that way in the past. It is not very helpful for this House to sit and look at completely new estimates when we have no idea of what took place in the past.

Hon. Mr. Lang: It was approximately \$675,000 last year. It is \$780,000 this year. In the area of small game it was approximately \$241,000. In the area of big game management it was \$483,000. If the Member wants to add those together, I think he will find that it comes to a total of \$675,000.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister repeat what the first \$675,000 to \$780,000 related to?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That was the difference between this year and last year.

This year it is \$780,000 if you combine small game management and big game management as opposed to last year which was \$675,000. There is roughly a \$100,000 increase.

Mr. Kimmerly: I would like to ask a question about the Yukon River Basin Study. There is no allocation this year, but I know that activity is going on. I wonder if the Minister would point out where the appropriate place to ask questions about that?

Mr. Chairman: The appropriate place would be right under Yukon River Basin Studies. I will bring it to your attention when we get down that far.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister advise the person-years that are involved in the Resource Management Administration and whether or not they are the same person-years that are dealt with under the Administration section which we just dealt with?

Hon. Mr. Lang: No. These are different staff members. We have six involved in big game management, four involved in small game management, two people involved in evaluation and assessment. We also have two people involved in research and planning and in the actual resource management administration we have six staff and one of those is casual.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister outline what the six staff in resource management administration are doing as opposed to those who are involved in the actual management studies?

Hon. Mr. Lang: You have a director, a chief of resource management with a biologist, two secretaries and one vacant position in research and planning and one casual.

Mr. Veale: It came to my attention, and this may be the line item to discuss it under, that the branch hires people to do short-term studies. It may be a study on small game around a community to determine where some problems are. When it was brought to my attention, it was in Teslin. People are hired on a casual basis to do the job. I was asking on what basis people were hired and there was some suggestion that there was a preferential list or a list of people that the Game Branch had when they wanted something to be done in a particular community. The concern was that there was no publication that they needed people to do the work. I wonder if there is a departmental policy that there is a list of people who are given preference? If there is, then it should be made public so people can get on that list.

Hon. Mr. Lang: No, there is no preferential list. It might be something worthwhile looking at if it was a Conservative list. That is not the case. I understand the Public Service Commission asks for names and then a list is prepared for the department. Perhaps it is not followed all the time. We did have a valid observation that in many of the areas where qualifications are required to do research in the field are perhaps too high. Subsequently, trappers, for example, who are familiar with the area are not really eligible to apply for some of these casual contracts because of their lack of academic qualifications. That is an area we are looking at trying to utilize the trapper in the area if we are doing a review of his area. We still need some technical people. Those people would have to go through an application basis as well. I will have to check on specifics. I do not want to raise names here. Perhaps the Member opposite could raise it with me and I could raise it with the department.

Mr. Veale: Just to get it clear, people should be not putting their name into the local conservation officer, but going through the Public Service Commission to get short-term contract work with the department in their community? Is that the position?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I think it would have to go through the Conservation Officer because the people in those communities that you speak of do not come into Whitehorse. Perhaps the notice is not as well circulated as it might be but I would suspect that that would be the method to be used. One would apply at the local office, as long as adequate notice is given, so that at least everyone is on a list which we could choose from when we needed some help.

Mr. Penikett: I know the Minister made a light suggestion about it being a Conservative list, but I want to make sure that he is aware that that is a serious issue in some other provinces. In Ontario, as recently as last week, the Ministry of Natural Resources were reprimanded for requiring that the Parks people, who hire a lot of people in the summer, and Natural Resources, in Northern Ontario, hire people from a preferred list which was a patronage list provided by the Conservative Government. We want to make sure that that does not happen here.

The second part of his answer, in terms of making sure that the people who may not have formal qualifications are used, because they have practical skills, I think, is an eminently sensible one, and an initiative that would be supported on all sides.

Hon. Mr. Lang: I just want to re-emphasize to Members opposite that there is no Conservative list and I, like the Member opposite, would hate to see that type of practice take place. The point is that there is a procedure laid down by law through the *Public Service Ordinance* and perhaps adequate notice is not given in these communities due to the community itself. We could check that out. I should point out that we have been using trappers and that type of expertise.

Resource Management Administration in the amount of \$266,000 agreed to

On Inventory and Planning

Mr. Chairman: Inventory and Planning in the amount of \$239,000.

*Inventory and Planning in the amount of \$239,000 agreed to
On Evaluation/Assessment*

Mr. Chairman: Evaluation/Assessment, \$90,000.

Mr. Kimmerly: I wonder if the Minister could explain what evaluations and assessments are done and what the \$90,000 is for?

Hon. Mr. Lang: These are monies that are allocated as a line item where developments are taking place. It allows us to do evaluation/assessment on a cost-shared basis with the developer in certain area, for example, the MacPass or Selwyn Basin, Pipeline, and various other things. It gives us the ability, if a development comes up that is either foreseen or unforeseen, to have the ability to act.

Mr. Kimmerly: Are there any items now foreseen and therefore, specific enough to identify, at least approximately?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It would be, for example, all land use permits, and this type of thing. We are involved with these and it allows us to go into an area where there is some possibility of a road being built, or some such thing. I do not have any specifics with me.

Mr. Veale: Relating to the report on the opposite page, regarding the "Natural Areas" and "Natural Regions", are they established and identified?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Yes. They have been developed over the years and if the Member opposite wants to know more he can come into my office and look at the map there. The proposed territorial parks are there, like Kusawa, a possibility up in the Northern Yukon — if we can sort out our differences out with the Government of Canada — Herschel Islands, and that type of thing. I do not have the specific list with me, but I can get the information for the Member.

Mr. Veale: I would appreciate that. Has he indicated any priorities in his statement regarding Kusawa and the Northern Yukon? What are the immediate planning priorities regarding these natural areas and natural regions for parks?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We have never really sat down and said that one is a priority over something else. One area that has been a priority, of course, has been Fort Selkirk, where we have put in a fair amount of work, as have our campground services people. We have been in-

volved, as you know, with a little bit of a problem with the Government of Canada as far as land transfers are concerned and we have just never had to sit down and say what we prefer over something else. I think if the land use policy that we Tabled this afternoon, which I believe the Member opposite was in accord with, comes about then that exercise will be done.

Mr. Chairman: I would respectfully submit that Members be ready to speak when called or else I will be at this all day.

Mr. Veale: I would hate to hold up this budget any longer than it has been. In this identification of the natural areas and natural regions, and so on, does any of the work that has been done relate to the establishment of the habitat areas? In other words, how far is the planning going on in the department regarding the establishment of those special habitat areas that have now been set up under the to-be-proclaimed *Wildlife Ordinance*?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Habitat is a part of it, but there is also recreational use and the various other elements that come into land use in this area. It is going to take another couple of years to really identify the crucial habitat as far as game is concerned. For an example, we have identified an area that we feel is crucial, as far as sheep are concerned, and are under a certain amount of pressure, as far as hunting is concerned, and I do not think that we will go so far as designating it as a special habitat area, but we will probably close off the hunting in that area. So those are the two elements of the Ordinance that we can use. The Member opposite knows that it is a brand new section, and I was very pleased to get the consent of the other side to be able to put it into law.

⁵¹ **Mr. Veale:** What is the sheep area he is referring to? Is there any reason why he cannot refer to it at this time?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I will be very frank. We are looking at what I believe is called Mount Mye, which is right next to Faro.

Evaluation/Assessment in the amount of \$90,000 agreed to On Small Game Management

Mr. Chairman: Small Game Management, \$315,000.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister speak to Small Game Management in terms of what the past work has been and what the future priorities are going to be?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I ran through the list earlier in general debate.

We are looking at an inventory of birds of prey, the falcon area, reintroduction of them into the wilds, inventory of fur bearing animals, and the development of species management plans. I believe we just completed one on the marten last year. I am not too sure what species they are looking at this year but it is an ongoing program as far as species in the fur industry are concerned.

Further to that, there is assistance to the Trapper Education Program and assistance to trapline administration.

Mr. Veale: What is transpiring in the goat reintroduction program that has been considered?

Hon. Mr. Lang: At the present time we do not have any intention to do that until we have successfully come to a conclusion on our Land Claims negotiation. Once that has been done, I think it is fair to say I would be very much in favour of such places as in the Jake's Corner area and perhaps in Carcross. I think we have to get the general laws as they apply sorted out so there are general laws that we all have to abide by. That is one thing that has been stopped and I do not think it should be started again until we have clarified the situation.

I just want to assure the Member opposite that I think it is a good idea and I would not mind seeing those types of arrangements in a new subsidiary agreement that we could cost-share with the Government of Canada, from a tourism as well as a recreational point of view.

Small Game Management in the amount of \$315,000 agreed to On Big Game Management

Mr. Chairman: Big Game Management, \$465,000.

Mrs. McGuire: The Minister did mention the overpopulation of predators. One, of course, is wolves. Does the Minister have any plans to eliminate some of these predators that contribute greatly to the decline in the moose population?

⁵² **Hon. Mr. Lang:** I indicated earlier in discussion that we had every intention of doing a predator prey analysis this coming year. We will probably extend our regulations so that one can take wolves until June 1st or 15th, as opposed to March 20th — I am not sure of the

present regulations. Until that is done I cannot say what is going to be done. It is a concern to the department.

Mr. Kimmerly: Would the Minister please describe the present status of the reintroduction of elk program?

Hon. Mr. Lang: We intended to go forward with something last year. As it turned out, the Government of Alberta could not catch the elk because of the abnormally warm winter. Since then, they have been looking at various plans of what to do with their overabundance of elk. It is not our intention to pursue it further this year. If we were to once again take the initiative, I am sure the Government of Alberta would be more than happy to comply. Budgetary restraints will not allow us to go ahead this year.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister give us some specific detail on the management plans that are going to take place next year and in the long-term regarding the Porcupine Caribou herd?

Hon. Mr. Lang: A lot of work has been done in that area as far as research over the last ten years. In fact, one of my very close friends has indicated if there is such a thing as reincarnation she would like to come back as a caribou because she knows she would have a lot of people worrying about her.

We are working with Alaska. There is going to be a certain amount of work done in that area. There has not been any major development, in fact, a lot less, except for the Dempster Highway. I cannot see anything of major significance concerning the herd this year.

As for management plans, we are looking at further moose management plans for the Kluane area as well as other areas within the Territory. We are going to continue emphasis on establishing a sound moose population. We are going to be continuing sheep and goat inventories as well. Our biologists will be going out, in some cases, with the outfitters of the area to do an evaluation on horseback as opposed to aircraft. A fair amount of money will also be expended on aircraft.

I would like to point out to the Members that I did have the pleasure of seeing my first elk. About a month and a half ago, I flew out with the department while they were doing a game count. The elk population is still maintaining stable.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate the present knowledge and assessment of the department regarding the Porcupine Caribou herd as it interacts with the Dempster Highway, and also advise what person-years are going to be put into the big game management of that herd this year as compared to last year?

⁵³ **Hon. Mr. Lang:** The study is ongoing. The caribou seem to be quite capable of crossing the road when they get to it. A major factor has been the regulations that were brought in that do not allow hunting on either side of the highway. We have had some problems — at least there appears to be problems with perhaps some hunting by NWT residents — but we will keep monitoring that situation. Overall, Yukon residents have accepted it pretty well, as far as the law is concerned. I think that has helped.

As far as monies being expended in that area, I do not have the exact figure with me. I do not think there will be a significant amount. The Canadian Wildlife Service, I imagine, will be doing some work up there as well. That is all I have to say on the subject but I think they are going to be able to cross the road, contrary to some public statements that have been made.

Big Game Management in the amount of \$465,000 agreed to On Parks & Outdoors Recreation

Mr. Chairman: Parks and Outdoors Recreation, \$168,000.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister just indicate what the allocation was for that line item last year. Are we dealing with an increase or a decrease?

Hon. Mr. Lang: It is approximately the same. It has to do with campgrounds, doing our inventory, as well as looking at the possibility of new campgrounds, designs, and that type of thing. For example, we are working on Watson Lake. We hope that we will complete it this year. It covers things of this nature.

Mr. Veale: Is there a specific demarcation between the responsibility of a conservation officer regarding management and conservation concerns and park concerns? Is there any overlap? Do conservation officers do anything under this item, Parks and Outdoors Recreation, or is it a specific set of different person-years that we are talking

about?

Hon. Mr. Lang: These are the planners. I think the Member would probably want to be referred to the following section in the Ordinance, Wildlife and Park Services Branch. That was what the realignment within the Department was all about. It was to combine our campground people in the field with the conservation officers, expand their credentials and allow them to do both functions.

Perhaps we could discuss that at that time, so we could get on with clearing this particular item.

Parks and Outdoors Recreation in the amount of \$168,000 agreed to

Mr. Chairman: Prior Years Allocations, no vote.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister explain what that is?

Hon. Mr. Lang: This is strictly a financial transaction. We have broken this down, as opposed to last year. That is roughly what was spent in that area in the previously noted allocations.

Mr. Chairman: Yukon River Basin Studies, no vote.

Mr. Kimmerly: Could the Minister explain what is being done this coming year, what is the cost and where is it in the budget?

Hon. Mr. Lang: I am going on memory, but there is roughly a \$3 million allocation, I believe. There are going to be certain inventories done along the river. We utilized this resource, somewhat, to do some of our Klwane moose study inventory, which complemented each other quite well. The three-year agreement is \$2,200,000. Our commitment is \$110,000, which is five percent. There were a number of things done last year, 1981-1982, for example, in the area of water fowl in the Nisutlin Delta, and there was the inventory of the moose population, there was some work done in the area of fur bearers and also some fish data collected as well in the lakes in proximity to the Yukon River.

This coming year there appears to be a fair amount of money to be spent on salmon inventory, stream habitat inventory, as well as looking at the grayling, as far as the river is concerned, and also there is going to be some work done with an economic model of the area. I do not have all the specific data. We pay five percent and it is actually an in-out recovery with the Government of Canada and it will be voted in a supplementary as a recovery. Whatever amount is projected and actually spent is an in-out situation, the way I understand the financing of the agreement.

Mr. Veale: Is it fair to say that the monies that are spent under the Yukon River Basin Studies have two components? They actually meet immediate inventory and assessment needs of the department and, at the same time, are fed into the whole Yukon River Basin Study project?

Hon. Mr. Lang: That is fair to say.

Mr. Veale: I have asked the Minister before about this and he indicated that he would be presenting us with a list of studies that are being done, the time frame, and when they are going to be made public. I hope the Minister will do that as soon as possible, particularly while he has such competent help on his right hand side.

About the \$50,000 mentioned under administration, relative to the Yukon River Basin Study, I am not clear on why that figure is put into administration. I assume that there is no allocation here because it is just an in-out entry. What is the \$50,000 for that was mentioned under administration?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Our amount is \$50,000. Roughly, we expect to spend a million dollars, so we have to vote the \$50,000. I have to admit I become confused on the financing of these agreements, but that is our five percent of the million dollars. I would not want to give the Member opposite misleading or inaccurate information. That \$50,000 is not recoverable, that is our money.

Mr. Veale: If the \$50,000 is not recoverable, is the \$50,000 actually going into studies or is it going into administration?

Hon. Mr. Lang: Administration. It is five percent of whatever is spent. Five percent of the total amount of administration, studies and everything else. I cannot trace a dollar here and a dollar there, but the bottom line is that that will be our amount.

Resource Planning and Management in the amount of \$1,543,000 agreed to

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report progress on Bill No. 5 and beg leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Member

for Whitehorse Porter Creek West that Mr. Chairman report progress on Bill No. 5 and beg leave to sit again.

Agreed

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

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Agreed

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

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

Mr. Fleming: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 11, *Seniors' Income Supplement Act*, and directed me to report same without amendment. Further, Committee has considered Bill No. 5, *Second Appropriation Act 1982-83*, and directed me to report progress on same and beg leave to sit again.

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

Agreed

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted. May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Graham: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled April 20, 1982:

82-5-15

Land: A Yukon Resource

82-5-16

Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments

