



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 21

3rd Session

26th Legislature

HANSARD

Tuesday, April 22, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Sam Johnston

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Sam Johnston, MLA, Campbell

DEPUTY SPEAKER — Art Webster, MLA, Klondike

CABINET MINISTERS

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

GOVERNMENT PRIVATE MEMBERS

New Democratic Party

Sam Johnston	Campbell
Norma Kassl	Old Crow
Art Webster	Klondike

OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Progressive Conservative

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

Liberal

Roger Coles	Liberal Leader Tatchun
James McLachlan	Faro

LEGISLATIVE STAFF

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

01 Whitehorse, Yukon
Tuesday, April 22, 1986 — 1:30 p.m.

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

Prayers

DAILY ROUTINE

Speaker: Introduction of Visitors?
 Are there any Returns or Documents for Tabling?

TABLING RETURNS AND DOCUMENTS

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I have for tabling a summary of employment programs offered by the Government of Yukon under the ligature for Yukon.

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

This then brings us the the Question Period. Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

02 Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Phelps: As was evidenced yesterday, and as we are hearing again this morning, the financial situation of the municipality of Watson Lake is rather critical. I am wondering whether or not the Minister has done anything since yesterday to make the situation in Watson Lake less burdensome upon taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We have undertaken, since yesterday, to help clarify our position with Watson Lake by giving Watson Lake a telephone call. We have indicated to Watson Lake that we will send a senior department official to Watson Lake to assist them in what are considered to be budgetting problems at a meeting they are scheduled to hold tonight.

Mr. Phelps: Will the Minister be travelling to this important meeting tonight in Watson Lake?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I will not be travelling to the meeting tonight in Watson Lake. I find that there are some fairly pressing issues in Whitehorse, including this one, in the Legislature.

Mr. Phelps: Is the government prepared to do anything with regard to amending the formula in the *Municipal Finance Act* so that people will not be placed in the position of having their taxes increased, as we understand it, by as much as 80 percent or more.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member's preamble was incorrectly headed, but in any case, the government will, at any time, respond to concerns expressed by communities. We have, in the past, responded to concerns that have been expressed. We have brought the matter up with the Association of Yukon Communities before. We understand that AYC would like to bring it up again. We have had discussions with communities on a bilateral basis with respect to what individual communities would consider to be a better formula. In any case, we are convinced that the budgetting problems in Watson Lake do not result from the formula itself.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Phelps: We have heard that the municipality is placed in the position of considering onerous tax increases. Even doing that, they would be in the position of having no money left in reserve, and all of this because of the reduction in the operating grants to the municipality from this government.

In the event that the municipality is forced, because of government inaction, to raise taxes, does the Minister have any opinion on how they can do that in view of the time limitations set forth in Section 53(2) of the *Assessment and Taxation Act*?

03 Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member explicitly states that any tax increase in Watson Lake will mean a reduction in the Assessment Equalization Grant. That is not true; it is wrong. The situation in Watson Lake is simple to understand, from one perspective. They have worked up unbudgetted surpluses over the years and should show a surplus in 1985 and in 1986 with the existing tax rates. That is our understanding, and we are going to clarify that with Watson Lake this evening.

Mr. Phelps: As always, the government is late and tardy in their action and notable by their inaction. Again my question is that Section 53 of the *Assessment and Taxation Act* states that each taxing authority, other than the Commissioner, shall by bylaw, on or before the 15th day of April each year, levy taxes.

How can this municipality levy taxes now that that date has come and gone? What has the government done to warn them of their obligations with regard to that section?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: They are aware of their obligations with respect to the necessity of announcing and passing approved tax rates prior to April 15. The assumption the Member makes, first of all, is that the tax increase is warranted and, to my mind, there is no justification for that. Secondly, the Member suggests that the Government of Yukon has been in some way remiss for not having increased Watson Lake's taxes. We are not responsible for increasing Watson Lake's taxes; Watson Lake has to undertake the necessary obligations under the Act to ensure all details are covered prior to the April 15 date. If they wished to raise their taxes, they knew the rules of the game.

Mr. Phelps: That is not the point, and surely the hon. Minister knows that is not the point at all. The fact is it is now the 22nd day of April. There is a problem with taxes. There is a very good possibility the community will increase taxes because of tonight's meeting, and they wait until April 22. Why did they wait until April 22 to have this hastily contrived phone consultation with the municipal government?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We have been in communication with Watson Lake for a good period of time. It is not we who are responsible to pass this measure through the community. If the Member wants to know why the time lag between first, second and third reading of the Act and why they were done in the way they were done, he should ask the Council of Watson Lake, not this government.

Question re: Daycare

Mr. McLachlan: I have a question for the Minister of Health and Human Resources with regard to daycare. Is the Minister aware that the present child-training courses in the Yukon are still woefully inadequate in a lot of cases to meet the present needs of daycare workers in the territory?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I am aware that we do have a program available, and I am also aware that the courses would take an awful long time to complete before someone was able to get their certificate or degree. We are aware there are some problems with that.

04 Mr. McLachlan: Has the Minister, with what she has just expressed to the House about their concerns, made any arrangements with the Minister of Education for the introduction of courses that would be more comprehensive and more accessible to the daycare workers?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We are both aware that we have to look down the road at improving that course for the daycare workers. The Minister of Education and I will be discussing that in future. At this point in time, there is not the space nor the instructors. We are looking down the road at trying to improve that program.

Mr. McLachlan: Has the Minister asked for a meeting with the daycare and the family dayhome operators to discuss the problems that they are having with respect to the training of personnel?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I have not asked for a meeting, but I have met with them and spoke at their annual meeting just the week before last. I was there to answer any questions that they might have had. That never came up. I cannot see any problem with meeting with them sometime very shortly, to talk about that program.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Lang: I wanted to go back to the major difficulties faced by the community of Watson Lake and the Town of Faro. Is the Minister aware of Section 53(2) of the *Assessment and Taxation Act* that reads as follows: "Each taxing authority other than the Commissioner shall by bylaw made on or before the 15th day of April in each year levy taxes in accordance with this Act upon all taxable real property that is within its jurisdiction."

It says "shall". Is the Minister aware of this particular section? What can a community such as Watson Lake or Faro do now that April 15 has passed?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I am aware of that particular section. In Watson Lake's case, there is the legal interpretation that the community's tax increase could, conceivably, because it has expressed its interest through first and second reading of applying a tax increase to the community, be considered to conform to the terms of the act. With respect to what can be done, it is my understanding that an Order-in-Council can be passed to extend the deadline to allow for late submissions.

Mr. Lang: Is it the intention of the government to make regulations and have they been passed?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member again assumes that there is the need for a tax increase in Watson Lake. That has not, by any stretch of the imagination, been established. Certainly it has not been established that any tax increase, should it be found necessary, is a result of a reduction in the Assessment Equalization Grant.

A senior official from the department will be discussing that very question with the town management this afternoon and will be present at the town meeting this evening.

Mr. Lang: Why does the Minister now stand in this House to say the opposite of to what we have been told by the municipality of Watson Lake: that a tax increase will not be necessary to balance the budget? Has something come up since yesterday? If it has, we would like to hear about it.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: My understanding of the situation in Watson Lake has been consistent all along. I stated exactly what I felt yesterday with respect to the situation. It is consistent with today. The misinterpretation that the Members have put on the situation has fooled them into thinking that what they have been saying is true. It is not.

Speaker: Order. Will the Member wait until he is recognized?

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Lang: There is no question that \$35,000 less is being transferred to the community of Watson Lake and a major increase in property taxes is expected in that community. The Minister of Tourism has offered the community \$250,000 to build a ski chalet sometime over the course of this year. The money was turned down by the ski association and the town because they knew they could not afford the operation and maintenance of such a structure. Would the Minister be prepared to transfer \$50,000 of the \$250,000 that he offered the town approximately six months ago?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The information is entirely incorrect. I did not, under the Department of Tourism, offer \$200,000 to the Town of Watson Lake to construct a ski chalet.

Mr. Lang: Is it not true that some figures were discussed at some time by the Minister of Tourism with the community of Watson Lake for the purpose of building a chalet? Was that not discussed at some point and were not some quasi commitments made by the government to provide some capital funding? Is that not an accurate statement?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: As the Minister of Community and Transportation Services, with respect to the construction of recreation facilities, I did not offer Watson Lake a quasi commitment to cost-share a ski chalet. They were offered a commitment in the capital budget that has been passed by this House.

Mr. Lang: Would the Minister of Tourism be prepared to take \$50,000 out of that commitment and transfer it to the community of Watson Lake to help defray taxes as opposed to building an edifice on behalf of the MLA?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The Member for Porter Creek East

would have the Legislature make nonsense of formula financing arrangements in this territory. We will refuse to do that consistently in our dealings with all the communities. Our understanding is that the Town of Watson Lake has worked up unbudgetted surpluses for the last couple of years, and there should be no reason whatsoever that the town should raise its taxes. They should not be in the financial bind that they claim they are.

Question re: Watson Lake taxation

Mr. Lang: Is it the position of the government that any community that budgets wisely over the course of a year or two, and does have some surplus that, under the *Municipal Finance Act*, we will take from that surplus and leave them in a break even situation where they cannot have any money to deal with unforeseen events such as major water breaks, things of that type? Is that position the policy position the government takes?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: No. The formula does not take into account the surpluses. They have budgetted over the past few years in such a manner that they have created significant surpluses that tells everyone concerned that they have sufficient funds under the existing formula arrangements, even with the \$35,000 decrease in the assessment. In one particular grant, they have sufficient funds to operate their community. They have more than sufficient funds. Even if they did not choose to use their surplus, they would have more than sufficient funds to operate that community.

Mr. Lang: I would strongly recommend that the Minister leave the Question Period after it is completed and drive down to Watson Lake and face the people there and tell them that. That is not the advice I have been receiving.

Why does the Minister, under the *Municipal Finance Act*, think it is fair that the community of Faro gets an increase of \$80,000, the City of Whitehorse gets an increase of \$143,000, and the community of Watson Lake sees a decrease of \$35,000? Could he explain to this House why he believes that particular formula is fair, the way it is presently administered?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The assessment rates in Watson Lake increased by, in the neighbourhood of, \$16 million; therefore, the revenue generating potential of that community increased dramatically, well beyond the decrease in the Assessment Equalization Grant. The assessments decreased in Faro dramatically in that same period. The determination of the grant itself is based on a formula that was worked out and considered fair to cover communities that are in trouble; those communities that see good times, those communities that see bad times. That is the intent of this particular grant under the municipal operating grant arrangement between the Government of Yukon and the communities.

I would be more than happy to discuss the situation with any Watson Lake resident at any time. The issue is more between the Watson Lake residents and the Town Council than it is between the Watson Lake residents and the Government of Yukon.

Mr. Lang: As far as the community of Faro is concerned, the assessments have gone down, plus the services required have gone down. They are not running their arena, they are not running those facilities that they normally do run. I do not understand your argument why they get an \$80,000 increase, and a community such as Watson Lake is penalized.

Could the Minister explain to this House why, in view of the fact that it was brought to his attention in February, he is not bringing forward amendments to that bill that we guaranteed quick passage to in February?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The formula, for the Member's edification, is based on assessments and dwelling unit counts in communities, not on the anticipated operating budgets of communities. The communities have to tailor their operating budgets in accordance with the kind of revenue that they think they can seek, both from the Government of Yukon, Government of Canada and from their own taxpayers. They do not set an operating budget and then expect increases from the government. The government gives them funding under a formula, which is established by the communities, and is considered fair by the communities. From that formula they base their operating budgets and the services they can offer to their community.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, . . .

Speaker: Order please. The next speaker is Liberal. You had your two supplementaries.

Question re: Willingdon Correctional Institute

Mr. Coles: A couple of weeks ago, I asked the Minister of Human Resources in the House how many young offenders from the Yukon were in Willingdon, and was told three. The next day in the paper it was reported that there were six. Could the Minister tell us today how many young offenders we do have in Willingdon?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: We now have six. We have five young offenders who have been sentenced to secure custody, and we have one in remand awaiting trial.

Mr. Coles: Has the Minister or her department had any undertakings whatsoever with Alberta or any of the provinces to attempt to put our young offenders in a secure facility other than Willingdon?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: In view of the problems we have been facing in keeping our young offenders at home, we had anticipated we would be able to do that. Problems have occurred as a result of plans made in the past. If we feel we are going to have to send out our young offenders, we are going to have to look at alternative places to send them. I do not like to see our young offenders in a place like Willingdon. It is a very old establishment and if there is another place we can send them, I think we should look at it. There has been some consultation with Alberta in the past and if we have to, we will start looking at that idea again.

Mr. Coles: I agree with the Minister that the Yukon is the best place to keep our young people, if we can. But even so, if we do build the six-bed facility she wants, there may be times in the future even with a secure facility that we will have to use an outside facility of some type. Have we sent any kids in the past to any other secure facility, other than Willingdon?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: Under the old *Juvenile Delinquents Act*, we used to send our young offenders to different areas in Canada. Some of them were a lot different. With the change to the *Young Offenders Act*, those facilities have also been redesignated as places to hold young people. I am not really sure whether or not we sent any of our young offenders to any other place since the implementation of the *Young Offenders Act*, but I could find that out.

Question re: Tatshenshini River

Mr. Brewster: My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Last night in Committee debate, the Minister stated categorically on several occasions that the government had not presented any position to any public body regarding the Tatshenshini River area, yet today I have for tabling a letter dated December 10, 1985 from the Deputy Minister of Renewable Resources to the BC Special Advisory Committee on Wilderness Preservation that outlines the governments position.

Why did not the Minister know this policy position was sent, and why has he not seen it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have the same document the Member refers to. The question last night, as I recall it, was: had the government taken an official position. My response clearly was that the government had not taken an official position, but a memorandum obviously had been delivered by the Deputy Minister to the committee studying the Tatshenshini River.

Mr. Brewster: Why was the Minister not aware until this morning that that document was out. I do not recall at any time that we asked for an official document. We asked if you had put a position forward.

Hon. Mr. Porter: There are a lot of things that people are constantly not aware of with respect to issues of concern. There has been a memorandum delivered by the Deputy Minister. If the Member read the memorandum, he will note that it was an opportunity to welcome some tripartite discussions among Alaska, British Columbia and ourselves for future decisions that affect the Tatshenshini.

Mr. Brewster: Why does the Minister believe that the Tatshenshini River is not important enough to warrant his attention?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Obviously the Tatshenshini is important. As

a matter of fact, in the study that was completed on the heritage rivers, it is one of 68 rivers in the Yukon that has been identified as a river of significant concern. I feel really good about the Tatshenshini. I took a rafting trip on the river, tasted the water, and it is a magnificent river, and I think that it is a credible resource to the Yukon.

Question re: Heritage river criteria

Mr. Phillips: In response to a question last night from the Member for Kluane, the Minister for Renewable Resources was very vague, to say the least. I will ask a similar question now, but I would like the Minister to be a little more specific, if he could. What are the specific criteria to establish a heritage river in the Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would submit that Question Period, as the guidelines very clearly state, is for urging and pressing public concerns. If I were to go through the three pages of guidelines, I think that would be inappropriate for Question Period. If the Member wants to continue this discussion when we finish here, we will be back into Bill No. 17. When we come to that line item, I will discuss the information with the Member.

Mr. Phillips: The reason that I am asking the question today is because we did not get any answers last night. I am wondering where we do get answers. Can the Minister tell us if there are any specific limitations of use put on these rivers, for example, with respect to hunting, fishing, mining, dam developments or other developments on the rivers?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If a river makes it through the process that is outlined in the federal program — and a major part of the process is that there has to be a joint agreement between the submitting jurisdiction and the federal government — there has to be a management plan agreed to with the use of that river. That management plan in its specifics would detail the uses that would be associated with that river.

Mr. Phillips: I am absolutely amazed. The Minister has all of a sudden remembered what a heritage river is all about. I am wondering why we did not get this same answer to the same question last night.

Are there any other Yukon rivers presently being looked at or studied for heritage river designation? If so, what are the specific rivers?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As I mentioned in the debate last night, the specific river that is being looked at at the present time is the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River. As I indicated, other rivers in the Yukon are being looked at on an inventory basis. The only active consideration with respect to nomination for heritage river is the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River.

Question re: White Pass Railway

Mr. McLachlan: Is the Minister of Transportation Services able to tell this House if the \$3.7 million that White Pass is presently seeking for lease of the railway operations is anywhere near the break even level that the railway operated at during its final year in 1982?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I do not really understand the intent of the Member's question. If the Member was suggesting that \$3.7 million is what the company was making in terms of profit, or if that was the figure that it cost the company to operate, then I think \$3.7 million would be far out in both cases.

With respect to profits, the company claimed it was making next to none; that it was losing. With respect to operating expenses, I would say that we would probably be looking at between \$25 million and \$30 million to operate the truck-rail operation. I do not know where White Pass has drawn the \$3.7 million from, other than that they think this figure would be a reasonable return on a capital investment of \$20 million that they hold in Yukon and Alaska.

Mr. McLachlan: Can the Minister advise this House who is presently looking at the financial feasibility of leasing the rail operation from a government consideration within his department?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We are not looking at leasing the railway at all, ourselves. We are investigating White Pass's

abandonment plans, and we are also undertaking to investigate other alternatives that others may consider appropriate with respect to the use of the rail as a tourist attraction.

Mr. McLachlan: Will the Minister consult with other interested groups in this particular scenario that we may be looking at, if there are others that do have a vested interest in this, like the YVA, tour companies, municipalities, and the hotel people within the City of Whitehorse?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Absolutely. The community governments of Whitehorse and Skagway have expressed an interest in the use of the train as a tourist train and have stated that there are unspecified tourist operators that they have in hand who may be interested in operating a tourist train, if the price was right and if the conditions and environment were right. We will canvass all views in that respect, to determine whether or not the operation is cost-effective, irrespective of whether or not there is a rental charge by White Pass for the line.

Question re: Carcross-Skagway Road construction

Mrs. Firth: Can the Minister tell us whether or not the Treasury Board has approved funding for the construction on the Carcross-Skagway Road for this season?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Not as yet.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to ask the Minister, in light of the fact it is the third time we asked this question, and the last time he answered it was March 26, when he said he would let us know the answer as soon as he could: could he tell us what he is doing to speed up that transaction?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: We are interested in ensuring the Treasury Board review the application, because we regard it as being pro forma approval of the funding. The Treasury Board has delayed review of the application a number of times. We have concern that the construction season will be on us soon and the construction companies that want to bid on the project will want to have advance notice of the construction activity, and we would like to see approval as soon as possible. For one reason or another, there have been bureaucratic delays. I will tell the House, if we are sitting, and I presume we will be sitting, when we expect Treasury Board to approve the application for funding.

Mrs. Firth: The Minister said on March 26, the last time he spoke to this matter, that they were expecting the funds to be approved in the first or second week of April. It is past that now and there are tenders going out. I would like to know what the bureaucratic hold-up is, and what is the Minister holding up in not having these funds approved?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The government, at the time I made that statement, did expect Treasury Board to approve them soon. We were told they would be approved by the federal government, in the pro forma way, the arrangement to expend funds on the Skagway Road. They delayed that decision. I did not tell the House a lie, I simply stated the situation as the federal government stated it to us.

Question re: Skagway dock

Mr. Nordling: I have a question for the Government Leader with respect to the Skagway dock. Can the Government Leader tell us if a final agreement has been signed between Curragh Resources and White Pass for the use of the dock facilities at Skagway?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Given the number of people who, of course, want to redo and undo some of the agreements in connection with this, I hesitate to ever say anything is final. As I understand it, there is an agreement with Curragh and that company with respect to the use of the facility. Because it is a bilateral agreement, and is not something that involved us, I have no knowledge of the particulars. My most recent conversation with Mr. Frame indicated to me there was an agreement. Whether it is conditional on other factors, or whether there are riders or hedges on the arrangement, I have no way of knowing. I will certainly put the question to the company and if there is an answer that they are happy to have made public, I will report it to the House.

Mr. Nordling: I understand that the agreement signed between Yukon-Alaska Transport and Curragh may be in conflict with the letter of understanding between Curragh and White Pass. I just

wondered if the Government Leader was aware of a potential problem in that area?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: I am aware of hundreds of potential problems, but that is not one of them. I would be very interested if the Member would provide me with the source of his information, and that would give me an opportunity to verify it.

Mr. Nordling: I think that the Government Leader could ask either Mr. Frame, whom he spoke to recently, or a member in White Pass to verify that. That was my understanding. Is the government going to get involved at all in trying to settle this conflict, if there is one?

Hon. Mr. Penikett: Yes, if necessary, although I would think that normally we would have to be invited to mediate such a dispute, if one occurred, especially since the dock in question is not even in our jurisdiction, technically. It affects us profoundly. I do not mind telling the Member that there are a lot of people in this region, including people in the Yukon and in Alaska, who have been concerned about the potential bottleneck that that port can create, and the logjam in terms of movement of goods in and out that that could create for our economy and for our economic development. A number of people, including people in Skagway and people in this town, are busy exploring all sorts of alternatives to the arrangements that have existed heretofore.

Question re: Willingdon Correctional Institute

Mr. Coles: I know the Minister of Health and Human Resources is just as concerned as we are about the problem with the young offenders in secure facilities. I wonder if there is any other secure facility beside Willingdon in BC that we could be using right now?

Hon. Mrs. Joe: There are other facilities in British Columbia, but I do not have those names on the tip of my tongue. I can get back to the Member with that information.

Mr. Coles: We do not see where it would be possible at all for any Yukon youth to have any rehabilitation at all in the type of facility that Willingdon is, which to me is something less than a rat hole; animals should not be kept in there, never mind human beings.

I am very concerned that the Minister is not taking some type of action to look for another facility within British Columbia or another province in Canada.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: There are certain programs that are available to the young offenders who are sent out to Willingdon. They would take advantage of them at that time. With respect to what we are trying to do here in the Yukon, we are looking at a treatment centre in the Yukon, and had advertised for people who might be interested in trying to do something like that, where we could have kept our young offenders here in the Yukon and also take advantage of a treatment centre to deal with some of their problems. We are still looking at that.

Mr. Coles: I have information that the Alberta government has a new secure facility in Edmonton that is definitely not full, and they would probably be quite willing to take some of the Yukon young offenders, especially numbers as low as three or six. I wonder if the Minister could give an undertaking to this House that she would get in touch with her counterpart in Alberta, perhaps in the next week or two, and see if there is some arrangement that could be made.

Hon. Mrs. Joe: I can do that.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Recess

¹³ **Chairman:** The Committee of the Whole will now come to order. Policy and Planning continued.

Bill No. 17 — Fourth Appropriation Act, 1985-86 — continued

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think it would be advisable to go back to Administration. The question was asked yesterday what the total cost was of the JES under Administration. The figure is \$20,000.

Mr. Nordling: I did not hear the figure that the Minister gave. Could he repeat it please? Can the Minister also give us a more detailed breakdown as to how the Administration money was spent?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The figure for JES again is \$20,000. The funds under Administration are \$173,000 spent. The breakdown is transportation, communication, professional services, rentals, repair and maintenance, materials and supplies, telephone, and coffee.

Mr. Nordling: Perhaps the Minister can just tell us where the \$20,000 for the JES came from? What lapsed to make that money available?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The offset was as a result of a decrease in the use of casuals and professional consultants.

Mr. Lang: Why was there a decrease in the use of casuals that would leave that kind of money available?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Staff adjustments in the administration branch occurred as a result of an overall field work program that was less extensive than anticipated.

Mr. Lang: Would this have to do with the various programs for the purposes of counting moose, the wolf program and that kind of thing? Was there political direction to do less with that type of program?

¹⁴ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** My understanding is that there was a slowdown in the study area of game zones seven and nine.

Mr. Lang: Could we get the information we needed in comparison with years past in order to justify the studies? I mean it is one thing to have a slowdown but did it have any negative effects upon the studies undertaken in order to give us the data to make the proper decisions for the purposes of what could be harvested and when it could be harvested?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the specific question of the slowdown, one of the anticipated or projected decisions was to remove bears from the area, and basically we made the decision to hold off on that aspect of the program.

Mr. Lang: How much was that roughly, in dollar figures?

Hon. Mr. Porter: \$16,000.

Mr. Brewster: I presume we are on Policy and Planning?

Chairman: We are on Administration which was stood over from yesterday.

Are there any further questions on Administration?

Mr. Phillips: Last night we were told that JES was \$4,000 now we are told it is \$20,000. What is the difference between last night and today?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The figure given last night was \$78,000, of which \$74,000 was accounted for in the salary and benefits package to the deputy minister who left, which resulted in \$4,000 directly attributed to JES with the total cost of JES being \$20,000. It was offset by the \$16,000 figure leaving \$4,000.

Mr. Lang: I believe I asked the Minister whether or not there had been any studies conducted under this particular line item. I would like clarification.

Hon. Mr. Porter: No.

¹⁵ **Mrs. Firth:** I asked the Minister last evening about vacant person-years in the administrative area. Of the 13 person-years, did they at any time in the year have vacancies, for how long, and what were the lapsed salary dollars spent?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There was one vacant position, a Clerk II, and it was filled by contract.

Mrs. Firth: Is that a permanent person-year, and how long is it going to be filled on a contract basis?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is a permanent person-year, and it will be filled as soon as we conclude recruitment action.

Mrs. Firth: Does that mean that there are leftover salary dollars? Is there an excess of salary dollars from that permanent person-year position?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, there are not any dollars left over.

Mr. Nordling: I do not understand why, of the \$78,000, \$74,000 was allocated to the Deputy Minister and \$4,000 to the JES and not \$20,000 for JES and \$58,000 toward the Deputy Minister payoff. Last night, the only thing the Minister wanted to discuss was the \$78,000. He did not want to tell us what he did with the rest of the money, and then he uses the figure \$4,000 and \$74,000 instead of \$20,000 and \$58,000. Is there a purpose?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The purpose is that we are debating Supplementary No. 2. We have debated the original budget last year, which has the figure of \$774,000 in it. The reason why we are here today discussing this issue is because of the fact that we have brought in a supplementary vote. That vote, as represented by the line item Administration, accounts for \$78,000.

With respect to the breakdown of the \$78,000, if you look at the cost with respect to the benefit package for the Deputy Minister, it is plus \$74,000. You take away \$16,000, which is offset, and then you add the JES, you come up with a \$78,000 increase.

¹⁶ **Mr. Brewster:** I have a little problem with this. There is no question that we voted that money. However, this is our last chance to find out that it was spent in the right area. It is the last chance for this Legislature. The Minister has now changed the budget with a revised vote and it has gone up by \$78,000. I think we have a right to see that this money is used where we voted it before. I am sick and tired of him saying that he is not going to talk about this.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Obviously, I am not of the mind not to talk about it. I talked about it last night and I am standing here talking about it today.

Mr. Brewster: The Minister said that he would get back to me on whether or not there were tenders out on the fishing contract, drawings and the artist drawings. Does the Minister have that answer now?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Contrary to the representations made last night, the information that I received is that all of the artists involved were Yukon artists. The colouring posters that were designed for National Wildlife Week were prepared by local artists. In one case, the artist is going to school in B.C. The artists received \$150.00 for the initial sketches, and a local artist received \$1,205 for sketches of the fresh water and salmon species for the fishing brochure.

Mr. Brewster: I still do not have the answer. The question was if there was an open tender in the Yukon for these contracts and if Yukon people had priority?

¹⁷ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** The correct answer with respect to tendering is that it was an invitational tender. Seven artists were contacted and all of the artists selected are local people.

Mr. Brewster: Why would they be giving addresses in B.C. if they are local people?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As explained earlier, the artist in question is taking courses in British Columbia for educational purposes, and we support that.

Mrs. Firth: Yesterday I raised a question regarding public relations and projects the government had embarked upon. During the budget debate we talked about information and education in the 1985-86 O&M Budget, and we made an observation on this side of the House that there had been a remarkable increase in the line item for information and education. I believe it was a 121 percent increase. At that time, I had asked the Minister what his plans regarding public relations were, and some of the information and education they were going to be providing. At that time the Minister said all the plans had not been finalized and they would be working on that throughout the year.

Can the Minister now tell me what kind of educational and PR

programs his department has been producing and making public throughout the year?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Department of Renewable Resources has an excellent public education program. The program is involved. It involves our education and information officers being available to schools, conducting general discussions with the students involved in the production of the *Campfire News*, which was designed as an effort to let people in and out of the Yukon know about renewable resource issues and programs. It also is an area where we produce wildlife bulletins for consumption by our constituency. They cover various aspects such as hunting and trapping. This last year we had a video done of the Wood Bison Project. Those are some examples of work being done by the particular department of the government.

Mrs. Firth: Is the Minister still prepared to fulfill his commitment made last evening to bring forward a list of the educational and informational projects the department has entered into, particularly the new ones, because I am familiar with a couple that the Minister mentioned that really were not new endeavors or concepts. The Minister had indicated in the fall his department was going to be pursuing some new areas and I have some particular interest in those new areas.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, I will give that undertaking to the Member.

Mrs. Firth: I would like to follow up on the question I asked the Minister last evening regarding the policy person-year that was identified for devolution. The Minister made some comments about fisheries and forestry, indicating what that person-year would be required for.

I asked regarding the relationship between this person-year designated for devolution within the Department of Renewable Resources and the Office of Devolution that the Government Leader is responsible for. The Minister responded that it was not directly connected to the devolution office, which is under the responsibility of the Government Leader's Office of Devolution.

Could the Minister clarify his response, or tell us exactly what the reporting relationship is? Surely, this individual, if he is working on devolution, is not working in isolation of what is going on in the Office of Devolution under the Government Leader.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The policy analyst position that is dedicated to work on devolution-related issues would do the necessary work under the authority of the Deputy Minister and the Director of Policy Planning. The information that is gathered and produced by the individual would flow back to the Director of Policy Planning. From there it would go back to the Deputy Minister, and then from the Deputy Minister's office to my office. Then we will bring the information to the Devolution Committee that is set up within government and make that available. Should there be a policy decision necessitated as a result of this work, it will then be brought to the Cabinet and a decision made.

Mrs. Firth: That sounds like an interesting reporting relationship and organizational structure. Would the Minister be prepared to give me that in writing, just so that when it comes to other areas that may have the structure for the reporting that we are familiar with it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will do that.

Mrs. Firth: I have one final follow-up regarding the job description of the policy analyst who is in the position of devolution in the Department of Renewable Resources. Does the Minister have that description with him? If he does not, is he prepared to table that?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will table the information when I receive it.

Mr. Phillips: Last night I asked the Minister about the bison, and should there be a surplus of bison in the future, will the government honour the verbal agreement that was made with the Yukon Fish and Game Association, who committed \$8,000 to the project on the basis of that verbal agreement, and do what they said they were going to do in the future, and allow people to harvest the buffalo on a quota basis or on a permit basis?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I have asked the department to produce a record of such agreement. They have been unable to. They say that no agreement exists. Presumably, the way the Member is informing

us of this item, that agreement was of a nature between the Fish and Game Association and the previous Minister. Am I not correct?

Mr. Phillips: Yes, it was an understanding in the Fish and Game Association that the previous government made a commitment that this would be allowed. We have to understand that it would not be immediately, it would be five, six or seven years down the road. The Fish and Game Association at the time knew that there may or may not be the same government in power and we understood that when any government makes a commitment to any group — and we made a commitment of funds to support the project, that they would honour the commitment — and that is what I am asking this government to do now.

I believe that there was a commitment from the biologists in charge of that project, Mr. Hoefs. There was a commitment from the Deputy Minister at the time. There was also a commitment in private meetings with them and in a couple of general meetings where they came and talked about the bison project to the Fish and Game Association.

Hon. Mr. Porter: On the broad question of the herd, through certain policies brought about by governments, primarily in the U.S., and industry as represented at the turn of the century, we had a situation where there were millions of wood bison and buffalo. Today there are virtually none in North America. They have been placed on the endangered species list.

What this effort represents by way of a commitment by this government is to assist the world community in being able to some day realize a healthy wood bison species again. That is the overall and clear intent of the program. That is a reintroduction program through which we hope to, through the efforts of our government, establish a free roaming herd in the Yukon that would help the world effort to take the wood bison off the endangered species list.

That has to be of utmost clarity in terms of any policy with respect to this government's management of the herd. Should it be that in the future the herd replenishes and we have no problems with disease as has been associated with these animals in other jurisdictions, and should it be deemed that there be a surplus of that herd and that it is considered to be admissible to harvest certain numbers of that herd, then I would say that philosophically that should be allowed.

If there are no biological reasons why a hunt or harvest should not be conducted then I do not see why we would deny access to the herd by resident hunters in the future.

Mr. Phillips: It is very clear from the financial commitment made by the Yukon Fish and Game Association that they too are concerned about the wood bison and they too made a much larger commitment than any conservation organization in Canada toward establishing that herd. They share the Minister's views that the preservation and building of the herd is paramount. If there is a harvestable surplus they were guaranteed that they would be given the opportunity. I would hope that that option is still open.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Having established that, the option is open.

Mrs. Firth: Before the Member for Kluane proceeds, I want to go back to a couple of questions on public affairs. I would like to know what activities the Department of Renewable Resources now has the Department of Public Affairs doing for them? This department is responsible for advertising for all of the government.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We work closely with a member of the Public Affairs Department in preparation of press releases, ministerial statements and the normal functions that are assisted by the department.

If the question is have we created a public affairs function in the Department of Renewable Resources that has had the resulting effect of removing responsibility from the Public Affairs Bureau, we have not done that.

Mrs. Firth: I believe that was the concern when we saw the tremendous increase in funds. I was of the opinion that a function of the Public Affairs Department was to do some of the activities that the Department of Renewable Resources is now doing within their Information and Education line. Do I take it from the Minister that he is giving us the commitment that they are not creating a public affairs department within the Department of Renewable Resources and that is not his intention or direction?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The particular part of the branch referred to is the Information and Education wing of Policy and Planning. The Member is correct, we do not intend to usurp the responsibilities of the Public Affairs Branch of the overall government, and working relationships with that particular individual in the department has been very productive.

Mr. Brewster: I would like to go back to fish. It seems very strange to me that out of the eight B.C. residents, five are from Atlin. I just cannot understand what they would be doing going to school there. However, that is what they are supposed to be doing.

I will now go onto the *Sports Survey of Canada*. Once again I would have to ask the Minister why we are spending all this money on sports fishing surveys for Canada — and that is what it says on there — and yet we are apparently paying the bill.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did not catch the full intent or meaning of the Member's question. Is the question: why are we concerned about sports fishing? The answer would be because it is economically important to the Yukon. Is he referring to a specific contract? If he is, I would appreciate him letting me know which contractor because there are about 111 of them. Neither of us knows the details of such a large number of contracts and surely I cannot be expected to do so.

²¹ **Mr. Brewster:** The first one is for \$3,000 for Howard Paish and Associates in Whitehorse. The next one is for Howard Paish and Associates for \$2,000. The other one is for Jack Hitchcock Consultants in Alberta for \$4,500.

I am not even sure what the expenses are for this program. It states right on here, "1985 survey of sports fishing in Canada, Fisheries and Oceans and Department of Renewable Resources". I have a problem understanding why we are putting all this money out when the Department of Fisheries and Oceans looks after fish and have complete control.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We are all aware of Mr. Hitchcock's involvement with this government. Although the current jurisdictional constitution position of the two governments with respect to the management of fish is clearly defined as being, at the present time, within the realm of the federal government, we have stated that it is the desire of this government to begin to discuss transfers of responsibility with respect to the fisheries issue.

Along with that, it then follows that if our goal is to eventually become involved with fisheries, then we have to gain some expertise and information in terms of the relevant issues related to the fisheries question. Along with that broad outline, Mr. Hitchcock, who has been an employee of the federal government in the past, was hired by the previous government to assist the government with policies related to those areas. More directly, on a specific basis, he was hired to assist the government with respect to its negotiating position vis-a-vis the US talks as they relate to the Yukon river system and the salmon fishery resource that habitats that system.

With respect to Mr. Paish, my understanding is that he provided research in support of the transfer of freshwater fisheries, to identify gaps in freshwater fishery management. This work is not complete. Indications from the Paish work is that we may need an additional seven person-years, for example, to manage freshwater fishery adequately in Yukon. Unfortunately, I will not be able to make these representations directly to the federal Minister of Fisheries, whom I have not met. He has invited me to attend a provincial/federal/territorial fisheries meeting on May 9 in Winnipeg, but I will not be able to attend, because I will probably be sitting here talking about these things in the Legislature.

Mr. Brewster: I might suggest that if we had not spent two hours last night trying to get some answers and we got nothing but snarls and real sarcastic bits of answers and had not brought it up, and had your department sent a woman down to our department today to get copies of the contracts, which apparently you did not have. She spent all morning at it and finally we get some information out of you we would not have had these problems.

I would like to know how many of these questionnaires were put out in the Yukon, and were they put out at random, or were certain people picked?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Surely, it can be expected that we would

have that kind of detailed information with respect to the numbers of questionnaires that were put out. I would undertake, as should be the responsible action, to obtain the information and ask somebody in government to research it and get the information and bring it back to the House for the Member opposite.

²² **Mr. Brewster:** There must have been a system. They all have an address on them, so they must have picked people somewhere. Did they send them to everybody? They did not send one to me.

Why is a four-page document sent out seven or eight months after the people have quit fishing, and it asks questions like how much food they ate, how much they used, and other things. How do you expect people to remember something like that — how much was their groceries, and such things like this — seven to eight months afterwards?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I did not design the specific study that the Member is talking about. If the Member would like, we would respond to those questions as to the expectations of individuals with respect to their grocery consumption.

Mr. Brewster: Did the Minister design this, did your department design this, or was it designed in Ottawa?

Chairman: Order please. I would like to remind the Members to please address remarks through the Chair, and refrain from using the word you and your.

Hon. Mr. Porter: It was designed in Ottawa.

Mr. Lang: The Minister has mentioned several times that he is going to miss this meeting that I gather great things would happen if he attended. Has the Minister had correspondence directly with the federal Minister on the transfer of fisheries? If so, does he have an agreement in principle that negotiations can commence for the purpose of transfer of freshwater fisheries to the Government of Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In this area of fishery discussions, in terms of the responsibilities and the commitments and actions undertaken on a political level, I met with the previous Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Fraser, and that was a meeting that we held in Ottawa. There was a clear commitment from Mr. Fraser as to the intent of the government to proceed with the transfer. Unfortunately and regrettably, Mr. Fraser has resigned from Cabinet, and we then, by way of correspondence, articulated our position to the Minister who took over on an acting basis, the Member for the Yukon.

Once he was relieved of the responsibility, and it had been transferred to the current Minister, we again took up correspondence with that particular Minister, and we have indicated our position to the current federal Minister.

Mr. Lang: What is the Minister's position?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In capsule form, our position is that we favour a transfer and are willing to begin those negotiations.

Mr. Lang: When Mr. Fraser indicated to the government that he was in favour of a transfer, did the Minister instruct his staff to begin negotiations in conjunction with the federal government on this matter? We have had a year go by, and nothing has happened other than the fact that everybody has good intents.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The staff were so instructed. There have been discussions between the two governments, but there have been no agreements produced as a result of those discussions.

²³ **Mr. Lang:** When does the Minister expect an agreement to be produced?

Hon. Mr. Porter: One thing you learn very quickly in public life is not to anticipate these kinds of issues to occur on a specific date and time because invariably they never materialize on the predicted date. I would just say that given the mood in the federal Minister of Northern Development's office to transfer responsibilities and given the disposition of the federal fisheries Minister to begin discussions on this issue, we are optimistic that a transfer can, and hopefully will, be achieved within the next fiscal year. That is a general target.

Mr. Lang: I am somewhat confused. The Minister said to begin discussions. Then I was told in response to a question a while ago that he had discussions that had already taken place.

What structure is in place presently for the purposes of negotiation? Is there a working group? Who is on it from the department? Who is on it from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There is no working group concept established. It is basically our Director of Wildlife representing our interests in dealing with the individual in the federal government who is concerned.

I would like to point out that we only have one Director of Wildlife. We have put a lot of pressure on this individual and many individuals in government to respond to the multitude of questions. With respect to immediate priorities, because the international salmon negotiating resulted in a treaty that was signed by the two countries and left the Yukon basically out in the cold on the issue, and because of the fact that negotiations followed to try to change the situation, we saw that issue as immediate priority. We have allocated a lot of resources, particularly those of the Director of Wildlife, to those negotiations. He is the key person involved in the transfer discussions on a government to government basis. It has to be recognized that he has been devoting an awful lot of time to the salmon-related issues, which then impacts on progress on fresh water fishery.

Mr. Lang: I know that the salmon negotiations are a factor. I also know that the freshwater fisheries are intertwined to some degree. In view of the fact that there have been these discussions going on, what are we looking for in personnel transfer with regard to the financial consequences of the negotiations? Perhaps the Minister could also comment on the operational aspect of it. We should be at that point, and I am wondering just exactly what the Minister has to report to the House.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I missed the tail end of that speedy comment, but with respect to the gist of the overall question, the current responsibilities with the federal government have required less a person-year to fishery management in the Yukon. Our determination to adequately manage the resource suggests that the more realistic position would be seven person-years in the Yukon. I believe the second part dealt with the financial considerations. I do not believe we have determined a complete position with respect to the finances.

Mr. Lang: With the information I am given it does not seem that much has happened. I know there was a commitment for a transfer prior to us leaving government. Is it the intention of the government to set up a working group between the two levels of government? We have one designate from the YTG and I have not heard who is from the federal government. When was the last time these people met to discuss this so we could get to a situation and get the necessary accolades to the Minister for a transfer taking place? When was the last meeting of the interdepartmental group involved in this?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My information suggests that the most recent meeting took place in January.

Mr. Lang: I do not like to have to ask these specific questions but it seems we are getting two stories. Why have they not met since January?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Basically, because there have been other responsibilities that have come up between that date and now. One of the immediate things is the salmon negotiations. Three meetings have taken place since that time on the salmon negotiations and the Director of Wildlife has been involved in those meetings.

Mr. Lang: I want to continue to press that freshwater fisheries is also important to the territory, to the placer miners in the territory and I assume now that nothing is happening. It concerns me that neither the Legislature nor the government is doing anything. If we are going to go for that particular responsibility that we maintained we can do, we should be pursuing it accordingly. When is the federal government going to meet interdepartmentally with the federal government to discuss further the transfer of fisheries and get the necessary facts on the table? It should not be very difficult to do in view of the information provided, so a conscious, political decision can be made. Can he tell me when: tomorrow, next week, this week?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The individual responsible for the freshwater fishery transfer discussions is in Inuvik at the present time having just returned from salmon discussions in Anchorage. When that individual returns, the Director of Game and the Deputy Minister will move to bring about a finalization in the position of the Yukon

government and table that position for Cabinet consideration, then the negotiations will begin in detail.

Mr. Lang: Are the present land claim negotiations going to affect the position of the government for the purpose of pursuing this transfer, or are they going to go ahead as per the various agreements that have been signed in the past to get a transfer when the Government of Canada is prepared to provide the transfer?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to the intent of the question, and speaking to that intent, we will consult on an intergovernmental basis to ensure that the claims people know that the discussions are taking place. I believe that it was the previous Minister, the Member for Kluane, who was in receipt of correspondence related to the issue of consultation from the Minister of DIAND, who stated, in terms of the particular question, that CYI should be consulted. We would pursue that and make sure that they were consulted.

The negotiations are of a transfer nature, and involve the federal government and this government.

Mr. Lang: What is the position of the CYI? Has the Minister met with them to seek their approval so that this particular transfer can go through?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Given discussions between the departmental officials and CYI, the information is generally supportive.

Mr. Lang: For the record here, CYI supports the transfer of freshwater fisheries. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I am not here to commit the CYI to any position. It would be totally irresponsible to anticipate the position of another entity and speak for them. The Member asked for an indication as to their position. I have given him the best information that we presently have, which is generally supportive. I am sure that CYI, like any other group, would reserve its final decision with respect to whatever potential agreement is produced.

Mr. Lang: I am going to leave this. I have to express my disappointment. I would have thought we had gone further than we have. Forget partisan politics. I feel it is an area where we should be assuming responsibility. I do not think it is being done properly because of the financial considerations in part, at any rate.

Just to conclude this, is the Minister intending to meet with CYI in the near future to discuss this matter? If so, when? That seems to be a factor in the discussions.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would have no hesitation in meeting with CYI on this issue. Should the need arise, I would give my undertaking to do that.

Mr. Lang: I asked him when. We talked about the financial year of 1986-87. I was hoping that maybe it would be within the next month. Is it enough of a priority with this government for them to pursue it? Is he going to meet in the next couple of weeks to get this thing moving?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If we have the time allocated to this area, and if there is a desire of the parties to meet on the question, if we are not sitting in the Legislature at that particular time, — going on another roll for 21 days with no production — I would be amenable to meeting with CYI.

Mr. Phillips: I did not quite understand the Minister's answer to one of my questions. Is it now the priority of the department that the salmon negotiations have priority over the transfer of fisheries? What is the priority there? He said that most of the resources are being spent in negotiations and there is very little in the transfer of fisheries. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Although we would like as government to simply list the system of priorities, invariably there are events outside of government that dictate movement and change. Unfortunately, the two senior governments decided to sign an agreement that was void of any real benefit to the Yukon population with respect to the salmon fishery resource in the Yukon River.

As a commitment to appease the concerns of the people of the Yukon, Mr. Fraser moved that an individual has the mandate and responsibility for representation of Canada's interest. Dr. Davis, I believe, is his name.

There then developed a whole process of meetings. All the groups were brought together. The United States named a negotiator and negotiations began. We had to respond. We could not say that we

were sorry and do not want to talk about salmon because we are talking about fishery transfer. We have identified the Director as being the key person responsible. He has to respond to those demands out there.

We would like to do everything but unfortunately we cannot. We can do what we can the best we can and hopefully achieve positive results.

Mr. Phillips: I am asking for a very simple answer to a question. You have several people now working in the Department of Fisheries. Is there priority in the budget for working on the transfer of fisheries or is it the salmon negotiations? Which is more important right now to resolve for you and your government?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We do not have seven people working on fisheries. The seven person-years that we talked about is what we estimate for the personnel needs to be able to efficiently run a freshwater fisheries branch in the Department of Renewable Resources. That is the position that we have taken on the transfer issue.

I would suggest that the current events and demands as brought about by the acceleration of the international salmon talks would indicate that our immediate priority is to try and meet the demands of those salmon negotiations.

Mr. Phillips: The Minister said that because of the ongoing negotiations and rushing negotiations is not an immediate priority. If the Minister would look back at the wildlife hearings that took place in the territory he would see that one of the very highest priorities of Yukoners was the state of the freshwater fishery in the Yukon. We cannot afford to sit back any longer and wait for the federal fisheries people to come to us. We have to go to them immediately.

I suggest to you that it is a higher priority right now than saltwater fisheries. Saltwater fisheries will never, never, be our responsibility. Although it will involve some jobs, will involve some input from Yukoners, it will not be our responsibility. Our responsibility will be freshwater fisheries and the Yukon should take the initiative now. It should make the move now. The Minister should give us assurances in this House and give other Yukoners, all the people who stood up in front of the committee, people who have written him letters, and tell them now when he will make it an initiative and when he will get that transfer to the Yukon so we can make the decisions here for the betterment of freshwater fisheries in the Yukon.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If he is asking for a personal initiative and a personal commitment by myself, and if the Member would agree and his Caucus would support the idea of adjournment of the House on the days of 7, 8 and 9 of May, I would undertake to represent the interests of the people of the Yukon directly at a federal-provincial-territorial fisheries Ministers meeting and discuss this issue.

Mr. Brewster: For a while the Minister almost had me convinced that we were doing something wrong by keeping the gentleman here. I realize he would like his trip down there. However, it is quite apparent by listening to this last bit of conversation that he is not ready one little bit to do any negotiating at all. I do not feel bad at all if he has to sit here with the rest of us.

Mr. Lang: What is the problem with the Minister going? Go. Nobody over here said you could not go. I am sure that you can arrange another deal with your colleagues. I submit to the Member opposite that if he feels that he can be successful, I want to assure him from this side that there is no problem here. I do not see a problem at all.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I would be prepared to enter into a pairing agreement with the Member for Porter Creek East.

Mrs. Firth: What is wrong with the Liberals?

Mr. Lang: There are two opposition parties here. I recommend that there should be some discussions going on, either on the floor of the House, or where it normally does, behind closed doors with your friends, and he can sort out who he is going to pair with whom.

Chairman: Is this considered a frivolous question?

Mr. Lang: The point I want to state for the record seriously is that if the Minister wants to go to Winnipeg, he is free to go. That

is a decision he can make. I just want to emphasize that.

Mr. Brewster: I would like this contract explained to me. I do not understand words very good. I am not too good at it. It is made from David Burnett, in Vancouver. It says "preparation of background research paper on water transportation services into and from the Yukon". Could that be explained to me?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We will obtain the necessary information related to the contract and table that information for the Member.

Mr. Brewster: I appreciate the Minister doing that, and I feel quite a bit better that even the Minister does not understand some of the contracts that are being put out.

Policy and Planning in the amount of a reduction of \$32,000 agreed to

On Land, Parks and Resources

Mr. Brewster: Could the Minister explain to me what the reduction of \$3,000 was for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: This resulted from delays on recruitment for vacant positions occurring during the year; for the chief of regional planning and the chief of parks and resources.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Minister tell the House what activities come under this program line?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The activities related to the Lands and Parks deal with exactly that. The parks we are responsible for and the planning initiatives with respect to future parks, campgrounds in the Yukon, regional and land-use planning with respect to discussions with the federal government about establishing a cooperative land use planning process in the Yukon, responding to applications made with respect to agricultural lands, assisting in terms of analysis for FTLAC and the board committee process, responding to other areas with respect to cottage lots development, for example in the Haines Junction area where they are talking about some development in the Pine Lake Campground, maintenance, outdoor trail development initiatives. That is just about it I think.

Mr. Phillips: I am wondering about the Minister's initial response. Did he say that some of the \$3,000 is the delay in hiring a new chief for policy and parks?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Mr. Phillips: How many months was that position vacant?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I believe the figure was eight months. As to hours, minutes and seconds I do not know.

Mr. Phillips: If it is an eight-month delay did we only save \$3,000 in eight months? Are they not paying their people? Usually people like that get paid fairly reasonable wages and I would think it would be more than \$3,000. Why is it just \$3,000?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the offsets, travel costs were lower than budgeted because of vacancies related to the two specific positions and these savings were offset from salary adjustments resulting from the implementation of JES and then the overall budget reduction from all of that is \$3,000. So it is a situation of minus \$22,000, minus \$5,000, plus \$24,000 and minus \$3,000.

Mr. Lang: Did you spend the whole \$115,000 budgeted this past year for regional planning?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, we did spend the money.

Mr. Lang: Can you explain to the House if it was on personnel, and, if so, how many, and, if not, what regional plans did we come up with and could you make them available to us?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The chief land use planner, in terms of the personnel costs: travel in and out of territory, telephone services, long distance, advertising, transportation, communication, aircraft charter, rentals, display materials, other material goods. With respect to whether or not we have produced any regional plans this particular year, the answer is that there was no specific regional plan produced for this particular department.

Mr. Lang: Who is the chief land use planner for the Government of Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yvonne Harris.

Mr. Lang: Was she not in Parks and Resources and Campgrounds over the course of this year? I would like to know when she took on this responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I believe in the past, the public forum has not been a forum in which we discuss the personnel matters of individuals of government. The answer is three weeks ago.

Mr. Lang: How did you spend \$115,000 in three weeks? We budgeted \$115,000 for regional planning. You said that you just hired someone three weeks ago. To my knowledge, there has not been any description of what is happening in regional planning. I would like to know where we spent the \$115,000. I do not think I am being sold a straight bill of goods here.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not know what the Member is talking about with respect to where we spent the money in the last three weeks. They are debating the whole year. We are going back through the budget debate again.

The position has been occupied for the majority of the year. My understanding is that the planner resigned for maternity reasons, and the position was filled. It is not as if we did not have a position for the entire year and only filled it three weeks ago. We have had an individual in the position. That individual chose to resign the position and we have filled it.

Mr. Lang: I stand corrected. I understand what you are saying. Somebody had held that position and someone else has moved into it. I was given the impression that it had just been filled and had been vacant.

What areas are we studying under regional planning?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The large chunk of the responsibility for this department would be the land use planning area. As the Member is very aware, there has been, over the years, on and off negotiations for land use planning. We revived those discussions, and there have been continuous meetings between ourselves and the federal government. We are very close to an agreement. Other duties relate to specific land requests brought about by way of the agricultural program of the department, as well as the other initiatives with respect to recreational land use.

Mr. Brewster: At the start, I brought up the department objectives about resources. Then I noticed Lands, Parks, and Resources. Maybe the Minister could explain what resources means now.

Hon. Mr. Porter: I checked the O&M Mains from which this supplementary emanates. That wording is similar. I also checked the 1986-87 Mains and those same words appear again. Obviously, it has been a part of the objectives of the department for some time.

I had a discussion internally with my department and we decided that because of the fact that we are engaged in a review of renewable resource initiatives in the Yukon by the Select Committee and following the Select Committee we will go through the process of a comprehensive internal review in the government, we thought that we would not change the objectives at this point because they may just simply be changed again by the review process that the department will be subjected to. We decided to hold off on changes until that is clear.

Mr. Phelps: I wonder if the Minister could advise the House as to how many person-years there were at year end during the course of the year involved with agricultural applications for land?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There were three individuals.

Mr. Phelps: Could the Minister advise us how many applications were received during the course of the year and how many remain outstanding.

Hon. Mr. Porter: As of December 12, 1985, there were 188 outstanding agricultural applications. There were 24 applications that had been approved when this position was made. Seventy-four applications had been rejected. Of the 188 outstanding applications, 91 have been checked for soil suitability and 27 have been reviewed for agricultural viability.

In addition, 39 have been given preliminary checks for major land use conflicts. Of the 27 applications reviewed for agricultural viability, nine agricultural applications and one grazing lease application have been approved in principle.

As of March 19, 1986, a total of 10 requests for spot land transfers for agricultural lands have been made to FTLAC. To date, three of these cases have proceeded to Order-In-Council and Commissioner of Lands. Two cases are still being processed for OIC. The five remaining cases require further band consultation. To date, this has been difficult to achieve. In addition, one request for a spot land transfer for a grazing lease was made to FTLAC and is now being processed for OIC.

Mr. Phelps: Is the department going forward with the applications where all of the tests have been made and are favourable but where band council resolutions cannot be obtained?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We cannot give specific numbers of applications, but that has been the history of agricultural land applications that have been brought forward for consideration. There have been, over the course of the history of this program, concerns expressed by bands. That continues to be the case with respect to current applications.

Mr. Phelps: With regard to the future, is it the intention to continue to give this veto over land applications to Indian bands?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I see where we have danced this jig before, and maybe we will take another swing at it. It has gone for many hours in the House, but the Minister, who is the lead Minister with respect to land development, clearly indicated to the Member opposite that we do not view it as a veto. We can stand here and talk back and forth like robots on that question.

With respect to our intention to try to do something positive to get this area off the ground, to begin trying to deliver land, the Minister for Community and Transportation Services set up a land transfer process that is well underway, in which we are participants in the Land Availability Program. We see this process as a positive process to try to get the federal government and ourselves and the CYI and the bands to agree that the people in the Yukon must get land, and we should work out a process where land can be obtained for those legitimate needs that have been expressed by people.

Lands, Parks and Resources in the amount of a reduction of \$3,000 agreed to

On Fish and Wildlife

Mr. Brewster: Could the Minister give us the breakdown of the \$52,000?

Hon. Mr. Porter: For the budgetted increase of \$52,000, salary adjustments related to the implementation of JES. I will just read the note. That was a \$55,000 increase. Personal costs on the predator-prey program were less than anticipated due to modifications in the workplan for the study. The resulting savings of \$74,000 were redirected and used in other important wildlife management programs.

For instance, increased work was undertaken to study the wolf-sheep predator issues, and to initiate a burn project to enhance sheep habitat. Some of the costs of these two projects were covered from the American Foundation of Wild Sheep. Anticipated costs of falcon upkeep and the Second International Conference of Caribou, falcon upkeep was \$18,000. The International Caribou Conference that we hosted here in Whitehorse where we had scientists from all over the world come here and discuss caribou and reindeer, cost us an additional \$10,000. Contract studies that we discussed earlier on fishery management and wildlife management were another \$16,000. Additional travel related to the fishery transfer and the Pacific Salmon Treaty discussion was another plus \$7,000, added on an extra \$51,000.

If we go through the figures, the net increase looks like this: plus \$55,000 and minus \$74,000; plus \$20,000 minus \$51,000; gives you the end result that we show in the line item of \$52,000.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Minister tell us what activities are under this Fish and Wildlife Program? It is quite a large program.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Fish and Wildlife, under the Department of Renewable Resources, as the title indicates is responsible for the wildlife management in the Yukon. They look after sheep, goats, grizzly bears, hoary marmots, and red, cross and black and blue foxes. We also have responsibilities for small game such as rabbits, ptarmigan and spruce grouse.

We also have fur responsibilities with respect to all species of fur-bearing animals such as lynx, wolf, wolverine, otter and marten.

In terms of responsibilities for predator control, we have done work with respect to game zones seven and nine in the past. That work we anticipate will continue in 1986-87 on a scaled-down version.

We also have been responsible for the implementation of the venison and caribou herd predator-control program conducted in the Ross River area concerning the Finlayson caribou herd. There, the

two species this department is involved with are wolves and caribou. I might report to the House that indications we have received from that study are very positive. We are seeing an increase. Where we thought the figures were about 2,000 caribou, but given the counts we were given this year, the number is around 3,000. So there has been a suggested dramatic increase in that particular caribou herd. Hopefully we will get the caribou population up to such a level that predation will be an ancillary factor as opposed to a debilitating factor.

Other areas we are involved in are the peregrine falcon program and the gyrfalcon study. We are involved in the annual discussion with respect to the muskrat harvest in Old Crow, humane trap development and public information. We are involved in discussions related to the Fur Institute of Canada with respect to its mandate, and public information that relates to the trapping issue. We are also involved with the caribou issue, specifically in the Porcupine caribou herd area. We are also undertaking detailed analysis of resident harvesting of various species in the Yukon. We are also continuously updating our information with respect to the non-resident harvesting and being able to extrapolate and express in economic terms the impact of those activities in the Yukon. We are also responsible for the management of the big game industry in the Yukon and the regulation and management of that. For the time being that is about it. If there are any more specific areas I will let the Member know.

³³ **Mrs. Firth:** I believe there are six activities in this program. The big game activity is a fairly large amount, almost a million dollars. Is it under that activity that the predator control program is identified?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes.

Mrs. Firth: Was any money left over as a result of not continuing with the predator control program?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, we did indicate, at the outset, in response to the Member for Kluane's question, that there has been \$74,000 left over.

Mrs. Firth: Field services is also a very large activity within this program, over a million dollars. What exactly is Field Services?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Field services relate to the conservation officer program that we have in many communities in Yukon. I believe they are located in Watson Lake, Dawson, Ross River, Haines Junction, and Mayo at the present time. It also includes work related to campground activities in the field. This would involve Herschel Island assistance for that particular activity.

Mrs. Firth: What is Special Services, which is also an activity?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Special services, as the Member will recall, is basically a position that has been dedicated to investigation of a confidential nature, which would be the best way to describe it. For example, in Kluane there was some poaching going on and this particular individual was directly involved with investigations related to that incident, and the poachers were caught. In terms of whether or not it exists, it is identified as a person-year. We will inform the Member at greater length in the O&M Mains to take that position and allocate it to the community of Old Crow for the position of a conservation officer.

Mrs. Firth: In Field Services, again, the large activity that is over a million dollars, has quite a substantial establishment of person-years: over 32 person-years. Were there any vacant positions and lapsed funds within that line?

³⁴ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** The immediate response to that is negative; however, we will check the records to ensure that there was not a vacancy in this period of time.

Mr. Brewster: Could the Minister tell me how many person-years were involved in the grizzly bear study in zones seven and nine in 1984-85?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In 1985-86?

Mr. Brewster: Yes. Sorry.

Hon. Mr. Porter: There definitely were two biologists that I know of. The conservation officer was involved as well. We are trying to find the specific number for the Member. If the Member would like to move onto an additional question, we will attempt to find the exact amount.

Mr. Brewster: How many person-years were involved in the Finlayson caribou study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The answer is three.

Mr. Lang: Is the policy still in place for individuals to permit hunting wolves by airplane? If so, how many are there? Was that not permitted at one time?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Since I have been in office, I have not seen anything by way of correspondence on file, nor has this ever been brought up in discussions with the department, where anyone has been permitted to fly airplanes and use that as a method to hunt wolves.

Mr. Phillips: Is the anti-trapping campaign that the Minister recently announced in this line item?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No. That shows up in the Contingency.

The answer to the previous question raised by the Member for Kluane is four, for the person-years allocated for the grizzly bear program.

Mr. Brewster: That would not include the airplanes and airplane pilots, et cetera?

How many actual person-years were put in on the Donjek wolf study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: All we had involved in that project was the supervision time of one of our biologists.

Mr. Brewster: What was the airplane costs to track the wolves until March 31?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That particular question would entail some specific research, and we will undertake to do that and get back to the Member.

Mr. Lang: What has been the result of the predator program? For example, how many wolves were taken for the purpose of the predator control program?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The department was responsible for removing 48 this year.

Chairman: I would like to take a 20-minute recess at this time.

Recess

³⁵ **Chairman:** I will call Committee of the Whole back to order. We will continue with Fish and Wildlife.

Mr. Brewster: I do not have too much more on this line.

I have another one of these contracts that I cannot understand. Perhaps the Minister can, but I think he will have to have help with it. It is with Fraser Gifford of Vancouver, "Legislative analysis of the appropriateness of contracts as a mechanism for managing the YTG relationship with outfitters and, in particular, management of respective grizzly bear quotas". That is a mouthful.

Hon. Mr. Porter: That contract should read with Andy Thompson. Fraser Gifford is a legal firm. It is a new concept with respect to game management where, instead of going through a process of regulation of the industry by legislation, what is being looked at — and apparently this individual has expertise in this area — is contracting directly with the outfitters themselves for a set quota of grizzlies. It allows them to manage that contractual agreement.

Mr. Brewster: That is very interesting. I never heard of anything like that. I wonder what lawyers are doing with outfitters. Have the outfitters been consulted on this?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My understanding is that they have been consulted and are quite supportive of the initiative.

Mr. Brewster: In conducting a hunter survey in Old Crow, if we break up that contract it will cost us \$25 for each survey filled out. Is that not rather expensive?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I do not have the information with me. I will take the question under advisement and provide the information to the Member.

³⁶ **Mr. Brewster:** Maybe at the same time, could he possibly get us the cost of the surveys they have done in the rest of the Yukon, proportioned out to what it cost per person?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes. I presume you are talking about the surveys with respect to the hunter questionnaire?

Fish and Wildlife in the amount of \$52,000 agreed to Cost-Shared Projects

Hon. Mr. Porter: This particular item deals specifically with the heritage rivers program. The question was raised by the Member. We talked about this at some length yesterday, and in Question Period today it was raised by the Member for Riverdale North. Specifically the question was: what were the guidelines under this particular program. There were a number of guidelines. The first of which is the selection guidelines, and it states under the program that the Canadian heritage rivers must be of outstanding Canadian heritage value. This value is attained when it is determined that a nominated river is an outstanding representative of or unique in a province or territory.

By the inclusion of such rivers in a single coast-to-coast system, they become representative of Canada's river heritage as a whole, thus reflecting a Canadian value.

The value of Canadian heritage rivers is determined according to three sets of heritage value guidelines, natural, human and recreational. The nominated river may be included in this system if it meets one or more of the heritage value guidelines as well as a set of integrity guidelines. These guidelines are quoted as follows: "The National Heritage Value Guidelines; Outstanding Canadian national heritage values recognized when a river environment meets one or more of the following guidelines; it is an outstanding example of river environments, as they are affected by the major stages and processes in the earth's evolutionary history, which are represented of Canada. This would include rivers that best represent the major periods of geological time in which the surface of the earth underwent major changes and stream modifications. It is an outstanding representation of significant ongoing fluvial, geomorphological and biological processes as distinct from the periods of the earth's development. This focuses upon ongoing processes and the elevation and form of the river and its associated plant and animal communities.

"It contains along its course, unique, rare or outstanding examples of natural phenomena, formations of features or areas of exceptional natural beauty — we have a lot of lakes and rivers that meet that criteria — and contains, along its course, habitats of rare or endangered species of plants and animals.

³⁷ "This would include areas where outstanding concentrations of plants and animals of Canadian interest and significance are found.

"Human heritage value guidelines: Outstanding human heritage value is recognized when a river environment meets one of the following guidelines: is of outstanding importance owing to its influence over a period of time on the historical development of Canada through a major impact upon the region in which it is located or beyond — this would include its role in such significant historical themes as the native people, settlement patterns and transportation; it is strongly associated with persons, events, movements, achievements, ideas or beliefs of Canadian significance; it contains historical or archeological structures, works or sites which are unique, rare or of great antiquity; it contains outstanding examples of concentrations of historical or archeological structures, works or sites which are represented in the major themes of Canadian history.

"In every case, consideration will be given to the state of preservation of the river environment, relative to its visual appearance during the historic period in which the waterway is considered to be of outstanding importance. Recreational value guidelines recognize the man-land relationship essential to recreation.

"Outstanding recreational values recognize when a river environment meets the following general guidelines: possesses an appropriate combination of recreational opportunities and related natural values which together provide a capability for an outstanding recreational experience. Recreational opportunities include such activities as boating, hiking, swimming, camping, wildlife viewing and human heritage appreciation.

"Natural values include natural visual aesthetics, that is, diversity and quality of unique beauty, and physical essentials such as sufficient flow, navigability, rapids, accessibility and suitable shoreline capable of supporting recreational uses without significant loss of or impact on its natural, historical or aesthetic values.

"In addition to the heritage value guidelines, a river and its

immediate environment must meet integrity guidelines for designation to the Canadian Heritage River System. They should be of sufficient size and contain all of, or most of, the key elements: interrelated and interdependent elements to demonstrate the key aspect of the processes, features, activities or other phenomena which give the river its outstanding value. They should contain those system components required for the continuity of the species, features or objects to be protected.

³⁸ "The quality of the water should be such as to provide for the continuity and/or improvement of the resources upon which value to the system has been determined."

Mr. Brewster: I wonder if the Minister would mind repeating that, I missed the center part of it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If he would like me to read it backwards as well, I will attempt to do that.

Mrs. Firth: Could the Minister tell us what the significance of the supplementary is?

Hon. Mr. Porter: As we stated last night, the budget increase of \$40,000 is to cover the cost of work on the Yukon's nomination to the Canadian Heritage River System, which is the Thirty Mile section of the Yukon River.

As well, it is a study that is commissioned to basically do an inventory of other rivers in the Yukon. There are 68 rivers in Yukon.

Cost-Shared Projects in the amount of \$40,000 agreed to On Contingency

Mr. Brewster: Could I get a breakdown of where that is going to be used?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The breakdown with respect to the contingency is \$173,000 that has been allocated to the anti-fur movement, and we would like to describe it as our contribution to a pro-fur campaign. We discussed this as a Ministerial Statement in the House. As well, it includes the \$52,000 for general year-end contingency.

Mr. Lang: Do I take it that all this money will be spent prior to year end, and there is not anything included in the 1986-87 Main Budget?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, all of the money has been spent; the contribution agreements have been signed.

Mr. Phillips: I have a question concerning the pro-fur campaign. I fully support the government, as we did in the motion, in the pro-fur campaign and in getting involved in stopping the anti-trapping movement any way we can. I am concerned about the method by which this campaign was initiated.

I want to ask the Minister if any of the organizations that received money come in with actual proposals and say, "Here is what we want to do with respect to the anti-fur campaign, and here is the amount of dollars we need." Everyone who applies for a program such as this would come in with a well-drafted, well laid out proposal and say, "Here is what our organization would like to do." Did any organization do that, and if so which ones?

³⁹ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** The answer is positive. We saw this as a program that should encompass all of the active groups in the Yukon. Upon my instructions, we gathered all of the groups that were responsible in some way or had an opinion on the issue or indicated interest. We brought together a general meeting of interests. For example, we had the Fish and Game Association represented, a representative of Yukon Trappers Association, Yukon Outfitters, CYI, the bands and the Conservation Society.

We had those groups present at a meeting and we brought Mr. O'Malley, who was working on a retainer for the Institute of Canada, to give a report of all his findings that he had accumulated from his study in Europe. We also had the Executive Director of the FIC at the meeting to explain the role of FIC and the intent of that organization.

Following that general meeting we structured a working group representing those major interests. That working group sat down with the department and together they came up with a campaign. They designed the general parameters of the campaign and made specific recommendations as to what the campaign should look like. They, in fact, recommended specific dollar amounts attached to that campaign.

Mr. Coles: Can the Minister tell us how much money was given to the Yukon Trappers Association?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The total allocation to the Trappers Association under this program was \$50,000, \$40,000 of which is directly related to the production of a video, or a 16mm production on trapping, and \$10,000 of that \$50,000 is to continue with a very successful program that was initiated by the Fur Institute of Canada.

Last year they funded a couple of people of Upper Liard to travel to the campgrounds and make tourists aware of the trapping related issues. That \$10,000 contribution represents our continued support for the Trappers Association. They, in turn, will sponsor the project this year.

Mr. Coles: Was a restriction put on by the department as to the monies allocated? Did \$10,000 have to be used for that program and \$40,000 used for the film?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The contribution agreement very specifically said that \$40,000 had to be allocated for the production of video or a 16mm film. The \$10,000 had to be used for the summer awareness program.

Mr. Coles: It is my understanding that the Trappers Association wanted to use more of that money for the campground talks than they did the film. They felt that was a much more effective use of the money. I am wondering why the Minister has only allocated \$10,000 to that program.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Basically that contribution was arranged, using a rule of thumb in terms of video production, \$1,000 per minute for a half an hour production, and adding the contingency element of \$10,000 to cover unanticipated costs.

With respect to the campground public relations exercise those figures were based on costs associated with last year. If there is a concern with the Trappers Association wanting to reallocate portions of money, they have not made that concern known to me. However, should they want to change the terms of the contribution arrangement, as most contributions are structured, there is a clause for amendments and I would be prepared to sit down and talk with them about it.

Mr. Coles: I do not think the Trappers Association was aware of that, and they will be happy to know it. I am sure they wanted to use another \$5,000 or \$10,000 for the campground talks if they could.

As that program was so successful, according to trappers and tourists alike, and the Minister himself, I wonder if next year the Minister would consider putting a little more money into it, and maybe even his own department having some type of program or giving more money to the Trappers Association to broaden the scope of the project?

Hon. Mr. Porter: We have committed ourselves to this year, and we have committed the program to being administered by the Trappers Association. I appreciate the support of the Member for Tatchun for this government's future commitment to this endeavour. I will need it when we talk internally in terms of allocation of resources.

With respect to the question as to whether or not this government should be involved in directly participating in the program, I think the trappers have demonstrated a capability and ability to manage the program, and we should go with them and not have the government actively manage the program.

Mr. Coles: I just want to put on record that I could not agree with the Minister more on the last point.

Mr. Phillips: Getting back to the program, and the proposals, were there any funds issued to any of the groups prior to having written submissions of what they planned to do with the funds? How did that work? I am a little mystified.

Hon. Mr. Porter: To my knowledge, we did not issue them any money prior to deciding on the design of the program and the allocation of the specific dollar amounts attached to that program.

With respect to how the decision was made, they set up a working group and they designed the main elements of the program and recommended to us certain dollar amounts. That was the representation that they made to us. We, internally, made some minor adjustments, but came out with a program that represented the intent of the working group.

Mr. Phillips: Is the Minister saying, for instance, that the Conservation Society asked the government for \$7,000 to fulfill their part of the program, or was that a fixed amount? Did the other organizations as well ask for those exact amounts? Did they all receive the amounts they asked for?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the working group's activities, they came up with a set number of figures. I am sure that Fish and Game was directly involved in the working group, so they would have had direct input into determining the number that came out of that group. As to the final decision, in some cases there is definitely a difference as to what we were able to allocate within government and what was recommended.

I believe the figure that they use is \$190,000. We could not get all the money, but we did manage to get \$173,000.

Mr. Phillips: I raise a concern on a policy principle basis. Where I have a bit of a problem is that I was at a meeting of the Fish and Game Association with the Minister. The Minister talked to the members of the Fish and Game and told them what the \$7,000 was for. At that same meeting, the meeting was called to discuss what the Fish and Game would do with the \$7,000.

I am concerned about the policy. Is it going to be the policy of the government in the future to sit down with groups on issues such as this and look at giving them some money for a program such as this, and then having them bring a proposal in afterwards? The way things are done most of the time is that submissions are given to the government, the government looks at the submission and weighs the pros and cons, and then hands out the money. I am not necessarily agreeing or disagreeing that the program will not be a good one. I am sure it will be. I am just concerned about the principle of handing out the money before anybody makes any proposals.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Prior to the government making a decision, the Fish and Game Association had indicated to the government what they wanted to do with the money, and basically their position was that they wanted some dollars to be able to activate a pro-active public relations effort with other associations, their counterparts in southern Canada, with respect to how they would do it.

In terms of detail, for example the meeting I went to, there was some alternative discussion as to the exact nature of the expenditure. They could have simply made a decision to spend it on travel, but at the meeting I attended there was some discussion with respect to attempting to utilize the money to invest in a public relations effort that could realize more money being raised in the future, in other words, being able to increase the resource to the association. My comments were that if that is what they wanted to do, it sounded all right to me. If they wanted to use the resources government provided to them and use that to lever more resources and increase dollars, that was a good idea and I encouraged that and said if there was any problems with the agreement restricting that we would look at the legal question and make amendments to it.

Mrs. Firth: I want to go back to the government making the initial decision to participate in this kind of project. First of all, we are dealing with a very sophisticated group of people, the anti-trapping lobbyists and anti-fur lobbyists who put out very sophisticated documentation with their videos and with their propaganda and strategy.

When the government made the decision to participate and support the pro-fur project, were they setting a precedent? I know this government has not supported that kind of project before, but are there other governments in Canada that are supporting a project that would be consistent with this one?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In terms of the specific nature of that question, speaking from memory, I believe the federal government announced this last fall that they were contributing \$150,000 to ISI from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. I understand that indirectly, the federal government has been responsible for giving money to the Fur Institute of Canada for the O&M of that organization. Furthermore, they have funded the research center in Vegreville, Alberta. That is an institution that is designed to examine and test traps and try to achieve a more efficient and humane trap. With respect to other commitments by governments, I know that the government of Manitoba has been heavily involved in the FIC. The deputy minister, I believe, in Manitoba was the

president of the FIC, and one of the assistant deputy ministers was functioning in an executive director basis for that organization.

Things have changed in the last little while. The deputy minister of the Government of the Northwest Territories is now the president of the FIC and so those should be considered contributions.

With respect to what other governments are doing, we have decided that this is an issue that had to be supported and I spent time with the department and we have been lobbying other ministers in Canada. I met with the Minister responsible from Manitoba, and I have met the Minister from Ontario. The Minister from the Northwest Territories and I have had long discussions on this issue and we have lobbied other governments to make a contribution to this arrangement. We have a federal-provincial-territorial wildlife Ministers meeting, occurring in Ottawa on May 7 and 8; I guess we will not be there.

⁴² We have lobbied for that meeting to include in its agenda discussions on the anti-fur question. We were successful in getting agreement that it should be discussed at this meeting. The political level will not be there to represent Yukon's interests, but we will have representation at the meeting. The focal point of that discussion would be to convince other governments to join in to make a concerted effort.

One of the problems that we anticipated earlier on was whether or not the government should be directly involved in the campaign itself and we said no. To have the Yukon government and 10 other governments of Canada involved in the two major international organizations would be total chaos.

We have decided that the campaign should be directed and headed by the FIC and the ISI because they are the two groups with the expertise and have more or less cornered the interests in this area. We encourage all governments to do the same.

As a matter of fact, we are sending a telex out prior to the federal-provincial-territorial Minister's meeting informing them that we will not be there as a government politically, but informing them of the activities of our government to date, and encourage them to throw their support in and come up with a Canadian position from the political level.

Mrs. Firth: I thank the Minister for his answer. It is a very interesting area for the government to get involved in, in a sense, supporting lobby groups. I know the government funds various kinds of groups and has traditionally done so. I feel that the government has set a precedent by supporting this, and rightfully so.

I have some concern about how much analysis or information was sought before the decision was made and what the options were that were presented to the Minister in order that he make a wise, sound decision and look at the long term possibilities for additional funds being requested. I know the Member for Tatchun has asked about making a commitment to participate again. I wonder if that was something that was looked at. Were there options presented? Could the Minister just elaborate a little on that?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There were various options discussed in this area. We have gone from a direct participation in the campaign itself as a government to looking at funding various groups. There was a suggestion of some sort of commitment to an office in London, being that it is a strategic city in Europe. We never seriously considered doing that.

We considered funding, if not a government team on the issue, a Yukon team of Yukon interests, but that was discarded. There were various options of one type or another talked about. This is the end product of our deliberations.

The Member understands how government works. In some instances when you have a line item in the budget that clearly establishes a commitment and then we go on to next year. We do not have a line item established for this case. It is taken care of as a contingency-related question.

The government's commitment of funding is for a period of one year and there are no further commitments for ensuing years. In order to obtain a commitment from the government on a continuous basis, we internally would have to address that question the next time we sit down to discuss the financial position of the government.

In terms of the contributions arrangement, we have asked for the standard accounting from the groups concerned as well as some analysis of the effectiveness of their various programs.

⁴³ **Mrs. Firth:** No doubt, sooner or later we will have to have a line item. I would anticipate that this is something that is going to be an ongoing cause until one side or the other wins out. It will just be a matter of who can raise the most money and who can provide the most effective program.

The working group that the Minister talked about, did they have any experts on that working group that could advise them, say, in the area of advertising, and which was the best method of advertising? Who would that expert have been?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I thank the Member for Riverdale South for her commitment for future programs in this area. With respect to any provision of expert advice, we did bring a communications consultant to the Yukon, who had been working under contract to the FIC. He spent the summer in Europe doing an analysis and profile of all of the international groups that were involved, and doing an analysis of their membership, their funding sources, their campaign programs. That individual then prepared a massive strategy options paper for the FIC, which the FIC now has and is looking to begin discussions with the federal government, particularly with the Minister of External Affairs with respect to its implementation.

That individual was here in the Yukon, and spent an afternoon discussing with the participants his findings and also his advice with respect to how the Yukon should actively involve themselves.

Mrs. Firth: I believe I said that sooner or later we would have to have a line item in the budget. That does not necessarily establish a commitment on behalf of myself as a Member of the opposition. However, we will look forward to that in future budgets.

Did the Trappers Association, that is administering the program, have to hire any more staff to do that, or did they do it with the people who were working there?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The public awareness program that was conducted last summer did have the involvement of two individuals, so I suspect that they probably will hire again, and it will probably be two individuals.

Mrs. Firth: Are the salaries of the two people who are hired paid through the contribution from the government to the Trappers Association?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes. The dollar amount is \$10,000, and the Trappers Association takes the money, and they make their own internal management decisions in terms of wages and benefits and who they hire and how they hire.

Mrs. Firth: I have one final question on this project. The Canadian Wildlife Federation is quite heavily involved in the pro-trapping movement. Has the government had any contact with them, or are they considering working with them, or discussing plans with them at all?

⁴⁴ **Hon. Mr. Porter:** Yes, I had the distinct pleasure of meeting the executive director of that organization. In terms of wildlife-related issues, he is one of the most impressive individuals who is working on issues related to wildlife management in Canada. Furthermore, we understand that the Fish and Game Association in the Yukon has an excellent working relationship with the organization so there is always contact. As a matter of fact, the Fish and Game Association has a seat on the board of directors of that organization.

*Contingency in the amount of \$225,000 agreed to
Total Operation and Maintenance in the amount of \$360,000 agreed to*

On Capital Expenditures

On Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway

Hon. Mr. Porter: Basically this reflects a savings of \$125,000 on road construction.

Mr. Lang: Does the Minister have the results of the study that was undertaken, I believe, last fall for \$50,000 for doing research on the cultural history of the area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That particular study is in the process of being completed. It is being typed, and I would like to be able to go through the study. With respect to the tabling of the study at that

point, on principle I have no problem in making that information available.

Mr. Lang: Who did the study?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It was an individual hired by the Carmacks Band who has a degree in anthropology.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Is the individual local or is it somebody who originates from beyond the boundaries of our fair territory?

Hon. Mr. Porter: My understanding is that the individual had worked here previously on other projects and is a graduate of the University of Kelowna.

Mr. Lang: There was another commitment for \$50,000. Is that in the O&M side of your budget here, or where are we going to find that?

Hon. Mr. Porter: In the 1986-87 Capital.

Mr. Lang: In the 1986-87 Capital there is another \$50,000. Further to that, in view of the fact the landlord that owned the road was actually federal government, has the government got a transfer of the road right-of-way to the title of YTG?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Our information is that upon completion of the road, transfer is Gazetted.

Mr. Lang: Has that been done? My understanding is that the road cost less, according to the information I have, so I am assuming it is completed.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The road has been completed, yes.

Mr. Lang: Has the road been Gazetted?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I will have to take notice of that specific part of the question and find out for the Member. My understanding is that once the road is completed it is a natural process that that happens.

Mr. Lang: I am here to tell the Member opposite that that is not necessarily the case. I am looking forward to him coming back to us. Perhaps on the O&M Mains, we can find a place to discuss that further.

With respect to that particular negotiated agreement, as infamous as it is, it was never clearly stated whether or not the existing road was going to stay within the realm and responsibility of the Government of the Yukon Territory or whether that was going to revert to the Carmacks Indian Band. Could he tell me whether the present road that goes along the lakefront still stays in the possession of the Government of Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Yes, our information is that the road does belong to the Government of the Yukon and is under the responsibility of the government.

Mr. Lang: Then it is the position of the Government of Yukon that it will stay within the responsibility of the Government of Yukon, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Porter: That is correct.

Mr. Lang: As for the actual Frenchman-Tatchun parkway, I am just wondering if this is going to be it now, for the particular project in question? Just exactly what is the intent of the government as far as the designation of this particular camping area: park versus a campground?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I look forward to a visit to this area, and maybe the Member for Porter Creek East will accompany me on such a visit. In terms of the future designation of the area, it was recommended for a park, and we have since not proceeded with that designation. It is going to remain a recreation area. As to future work, in terms of the long-term plans, we are going to be involving interpretive work, depending on the results of the study being conducted, possibly an interpretive site and signs indicating the lakes, some signage indicating the history of the area and all of the natural features. I understand that there are some unique rock formations in the area. They would indicate where those are, the trails and the campgrounds. There would be that aspect of it to finish.

Mr. Lang: Following that further, as far as the agreement was concerned and the principle of the agreement was heralded in the Speech from the Throne by the government at that time — since that time it came under a fair amount of scrutiny and I think the Minister across the way would say, justifiably so — has the Minister gone into any other agreements with any other organizations, bands, or anything like this, like that particular agreement

since we last sat?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There have been some discussions with respect to the Pelly Band. There have been some preliminary discussions, but because of the fact that we did not have a park planner with the department — that position was vacant for some time — we did not conclude those discussions. It is basically the same concept with respect to a cultural-interpretive study with the Pelly Band, as their history relates to the Pelly area generally, and more specifically, the Fort Selkirk location.

Mr. Lang: Maybe I did not make myself clear. I understand that that is one element of it. I was referring more to the principle of local hire and local contractors in the area and the obvious deviation from territorial-wide contracting. I was wondering if the Minister had gone into any other agreements that we are not aware of in this area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No.

Mr. Lang: Do I take it that we will not see any more similar to that agreement?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The future is something that none of us has the capability to determine exactly. If I am going to be asked to commit myself not to reach agreements for local hire or for the use of local labourers, that is something that I cannot simply give a blanket commitment to. With respect to the role of the government philosophy, it has been put on the record that we encourage local employment and local hire.

Mr. Lang: I want to ensure the Members opposite that all parties here do. I think I can even speak for my colleagues to the far left. It is a question of how you do it. All I am asking is at least a 98 percent commitment in the foreseeable. Because of the situation that arose, I think it was unfortunate for a lot of people involved.

Hon. Mr. Porter: Whether or not I would be involved in the agreement as articulated by the agreement under question, for exactness, I would say 98.1 percent sure.

Mr. Coles: I made an observation on the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway. I wonder why it is called a parkway because I was ensured by the department officials in Carmacks that the word park would not enter into this again, either as park or, parkway.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The item had been placed in the budget under that description and so we cannot change that at this present time.

Mr. Coles: So next time we see it it will say Tatchun/Frenchman Recreation Area?

Mr. Brewster: Am I to gather that the parkway there is not designated under the *Parks Act*?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member is correct. There has been no designation under the *Parks Act* as a park.

Mr. Brewster: What authority would you have then to vote funds for this if it is not under that act?

Hon. Mr. Porter: It is under the authority of the Legislature.

Mr. Lang: What is a recreational area? I gather the Minister and his colleague from Tatchun have discussed this at some time. What legislative authority are we operating under for recreational area. It is a new principle that I have never heard before.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The specific reference to the designation of this particular project is the Tatchun/Frenchman Recreational Road. The authority would be the *Parks Act*. It means that it is a road provided to give recreational access to citizens.

Mr. Lang: I am still not clear on this. Perhaps since we have the expertise here, could you give me an example of what a recreational road is as opposed to a park or a campground. I understood that this was to be a park or a campground for the people to commute or to camp or to do whatever functions one does in a park. Now I am told it is a recreational roadway. Is that an official designation under the *Parks Act*? Since we have the expertise here, it will save me having to go look up the Act.

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, it is not contained within the *Parks Act*. The authority would flow from the fact that this has been presented as a budgetary item, as well as in the goals and mandate of the department. The department does have the mandate to develop an outdoor recreational area. This is a recreational road to provide access to the citizens who visit the Yukon and who live in the Yukon to recreational areas in the vicinity of the road.

Mr. Lang: What is wrong with designating it as a parkway as it is in the budget that has been presented. Parkway, under the *Parks Act*, is defined as such. For the record, it means a linear area bordering a recreational or historic travel route such as a road, waterway or trail that will be developed and maintained primarily for outdoor recreational activities.

Is it because of the objections from the Member for Tatchun that you are changing the designation?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The Member for Porter Creek East is entirely correct. The designation is still Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway and, until there has been an official change, it legally remains as such.

Mr. Lang: Since we are voting this as a parkway, is the government's position that it is going to be the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway as per the *Parks Act* or has there been a deal struck with the Member for Tatchun to strike that from the particular heading of the delineation of that particular recreation area?

Hon. Mr. Porter: I think that we can be sensible on this. If the legal requirement is to maintain the current designation that is put on the area, and if the community is still diametrically opposed to the word "park" and its official designation, I would suppose that our responsibility would be to look at legislative amendments to create recreational designation as a possible decision.

In the meantime, the official designation is Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway, and it will remain until such time as there is an official decision to change it.

Mr. Lang: There seem to be a number of things being said here. First of all, I was told that a recreation area was under the *Parks Act*, and then I was told a little later on in the discussion that it did not come under the *Parks Act*, it came under the budgetary item that we are talking about. Then I am told that I go back to the legal authority under the *Parks Act*. It sounds to me like a deal was made. If a deal was made, just come up front and say it. If that is the case, fine. If that is the price of democracy, let us hear it.

Hon. Mr. Porter: No, the Member for Porter Creek East and I have not reached any particular deal. I would offer him one, and that is an explanation with respect to this issue. Clearly, the legal authority emanates from the *Parks Act*. The legal designation for the area is the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway, as articulated by this budget, and it will remain such until there has been a change.

Mr. Lang: I think I have demonstrated it on at least one or two occasions, that I am not here to make deals with the side opposite. I want to refer to my colleague from Tatchun, who has a fond interest in this. I am curious if a deal had been made, and if it was the intention of the government to call it a recreation area and amend the legislation. I just want a yes or a no.

Hon. Mr. Porter: The legal designation is the Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway. There has been reference to it as a recreation area. That is the perception of it. It has not been designated as a park, per se. The wishes of the community have been expressed on the subject. They do not want a park. We would be amenable to meeting the needs of the community. If it is a park they do not want, then clearly, that is not something that we should shove down their throats.

Mr. Coles: Just for the information of the Member for Porter Creek East, I would like to state that there has been no deal made, and that I am here to convey the wishes of my constituents, not myself, who stood up in a public meeting, in the community hall at Carmacks, which was the first information meeting held that had anything to do with the Tatchun/Frenchman Lake Park. They said they did not want a park; they did not want a parkway, they wanted a recreation road, whatever that is. If a parkway says what the Member for Porter Creek East says that it is, that is no problem. That is exactly what they want.

Mr. Lang: After all this prolonged debate, it is a parkway. That is all I wanted to know. It just sounded like a deal had been made, and I knew that you would want it on the record.

Mr. Brewster: What is the procedure to designate a park under the *Parks Act*?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The section under the *Parks Act* is very clear on that.

Mr. Brewster: Has any park area ever been designated under the *Parks Act* in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Porter: None.

Mr. Lang: In order to get it designated as a parkway, has there been a submission under Section 10(1) of the Act for the purposes of fulfilling the obligations as set out under the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Porter: With respect to this particular issue, my information is that that designation has not occurred.

Mr. Brewster: Am I to understand that there are no territorial parks in the Yukon, they are designated under the *Parks Act*?

Hon. Mr. Porter: There are none designated. We have put an awful lot of work into the park that was initiated by the previous government at Coal River Springs. We are following through with this. Possibly Coal River Springs may become the first official park designated under the *Parks Act*.

Mr. Lang: What about Tatchun/Frenchman Lake for a parkway? It seems to me that you have done most of everything here, it is just a question of following the procedure.

Hon. Mr. Porter: If the residents of the Carmacks area do not have a problem with that, we would have no problem fulfilling that obligation.

Mr. Lang: Perhaps we should hear from the Member for Tatchun on that, because it will save a lot of deliberation I am sure.

Mr. Coles: I think with the election last spring the people of Tatchun spoke out about what they thought about the park. That is why I am here now. They do not want a park.

Mr. Brewster: Who actually constructed the road into this park that is not a park? Did the Department of Renewable Resources do this, or did Tourism do this?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The previous government had decided the Department of Renewable Resources should be responsible as opposed to Highways or Tourism and that department has been responsible overall.

Mr. Brewster: Who will maintain this road, the Department of Highways or Renewable Resources?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The responsibility for maintenance and road construction are clearly established by policy in this government as being the responsibility of the Department of Highways. Where the departments have need for work related to roads, we simply initiate contact with the Department of Highways, and they undertake the work and charge back to the department.

Mr. Brewster: Has this not been done now, turned over to the Department of Highways? To what standard has this road been constructed?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The official turnover of responsibility has not occurred, but the Department of Renewable Resources and the Department of Highways is working on it. The second question was the grade of the road. I do not have that specific answer, but we will check this area and get an answer on the road grade.

Tatchun/Frenchman Parkway in the amount of a reduction of \$125,000 agreed to

On Coal River Springs Planning/Construction

Hon. Mr. Porter: The additional \$50,000 that we are looking at here is for the completion of a road survey for the roadway and the length I believe is two 16-kilometre sections of the road.

Mr. Lang: Is total access now available to go into Coal River Springs during the summer months?

Hon. Mr. Porter: If you like to pack and you have a canoe, it is possible. It is uniquely located. There is a chain of lakes that lead to almost four kilometres from the hot springs site. People have gone in by the lakes and there are trails. They portage canoes between the lakes. No, a road has not been completed to Coal River. We are doing the survey work at the present time under this area.

Mr. Lang: When is it expected to be completed?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The survey work is being undertaken by the Department of Highways. They are charging us for that work. The road will not be completed this year. We are looking at 1987 or 1988 for completion.

Mr. Lang: Is this entire amount of money for the survey or was some road built with it?

Hon. Mr. Porter: This is all related to the survey of the road.

Mr. Lang: Could we have quick estimate of what the road is going to cost? If it costs \$270,000 to survey it, I would like to know

how much the road is going to cost. That was not the indication that was given to us when it was first initiated.

Hon. Mr. Porter: We do not have the specific information on hand regarding the cost of the road. That information is available and we will give it to the Member.

⁵¹ **Mr. Brewster:** Was the discussion between the department and the people who have the mine there settled to the satisfaction of both sides?

Hon. Mr. Porter: The discussions apparently did take place between the department and Sol Petro, the mining interest. There was an agreement to down-size the total area of the park, which was satisfactory to both parties.

Mr. Brewster: In 1983, there was a fire in that area, which burned a great amount of the timber. Did that damage the Coal River Springs at all?

Hon. Mr. Porter: No.

Mr. Lang: Just following up as far as Sol Petro Mine was concerned, I recall the discussion last fall on this particular item. We expressed our reservations about the size that had been recommended. If I recall correctly, I believe it was five square miles that had been delineated initially last fall for the actual park. What is the size now of the area that is in question?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Rather than hazard a guess, we would go back and get the specific information as to the original concept of the park, the land in question, the size of the land, and the subsequent action to shrink the area. I will get that specific information for the Member.

Mr. Lang: What types of functions are going to be permitted in the park? Is it going to be multi-purpose, and to what degree, if that is the case?

Hon. Mr. Porter: Canoeing, hiking, viewing of the falls and the springs in the area. The concept called for a system to transport people across the river and then a boardwalk system around the springs themselves. Of the 119 thermal springs in Canada, it is ranked number four. It is a valuable asset in terms of national heritage. We are going to take great care so as not to in any way destroy the site.

In view of the time, Mr. Chairman, I move that that you report progress on Bill No. 17.

Motion agreed to

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

Motion agreed to

Speaker resumes the Chair

⁵² **Speaker:** I will call the House to order. May we have a report from Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Webster: The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 17, *Fourth Appropriation Act, 1985-86*, and directed me to report progress on same.

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

Some Members: Agreed.

Speaker: I declare the report has carried.

Ms. Kassi: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. Member for Old Crow that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

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

The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

The following Sessional Paper was tabled April 22, 1986:

86-3-29

Summary of employment programs offered by Government of Yukon (McDonald)

The following Document was filed April 22, 1986:

No. 5

Copy of letter dated 85-12-10 from W.J. Klassen, Deputy Minister of Renewable Resources, to Bryan Williams, Ministry of Environment, re Tatshenshini River/Haines Road Corridor (Brewster)

