

R

350.823
McCard

TROPHIES OR MEAT



Yukon Game Management

1896 — 1976

TROPHIES OR MEAT

Yukon Game Management
1896 to 1976

by

Robert G. McCandless

January 7, ¹⁹⁷⁷~~1976~~

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1: SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF GAME LAW	
Before the Gold Rush	2
The Yukon Game Ordinance 1901-1920	4
The Game Ordinance 1920-1941	6
Game Law in the Recent Past 1942-1971	9
The 1976 Ordinance	12
Chapter 2: TRAPPING: THE MAINSTAY	
The Changing Economics	15
Fur Farming in the Yukon	18
Management of Fur Bearers	19
Indians and the Fur Trade to 1948	22
Registration of Traplines	25
Traplines from 1951 to 1976	27
Chapter 3: TROPHIES OR MEAT Part One: 1896-1950	
The Gold Rush	32
Years of Equilibrium	34
Market Hunting Between the Wars	36
Early Years of the Big Game Industry	39
The War Years	43
The Shade Brothers Crisis of 1946	45
James H. Bond, Propagandist	49
Summary: 1896 to 1950	52
Chapter 4: TROPHIES OR MEAT Part Two: 1950-1976	
More Hunters, More Trophies	58
Resident Hunting	62
The Outfitting Business	64
Management Aspects of the Guiding Industry	67
Chapter 5: MANAGEMENT OF HABITAT	
Peel River Game Preserve	74
Fishing Branch Preserve	75
Kluane Game Sanctuary and National Park	76
McArthur Game Sanctuary	80
Mt. Haldane and Pine Lake Sanctuaries	81
International Biological Program	82
Tagish Wildlife Refuge	83
Arctic International Wildlife Range	83
Game Management Zones	84
Proposed Nisutlin Bay Refuge	85

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 6: YUKON EXOTIC SPECIES	
Bison or Wood Buffalo	88
Elk or Wapiti	90
Ring-necked Pheasants	91
Muskoxen	92
Chapter 7: THE GAME BRANCH 1949-1976	
The Game Branch in the Fifties	94
The Game Branch in the Sixties	99
The Game Branch in the Seventies	102
CONCLUSION	109
Appendix: STATISTICAL TABLES	
Table 1 Yukon Population and Price Index, by Year	111
Table 2 Game Branch Revenues from 1920	112
Table 3 Game Branch Budget from 1950	114
Table 4 Total Yukon Game Taken by Fiscal Year	115
Table 5 Yukon Fur Production	116
Table 6 Non-Resident Big Game Hunting from 1946	118
Table 7 Government Revenue Value of Big Game	120
Table 8 Open Seasons for Yukon Game	121
Table 9 Ordinary Seasonal Bag Limits	122

INTRODUCTION

In September 1976, the author was hired as a casual employee by the Yukon Territorial Government, to prepare a history of game management in the Yukon. When the author was a government employee, he had access to all current Game Branch files, those held at Central Records and those available to the public at the Yukon Archives. Letters, documents and memoranda less than 30 years old are open to the public only under special permission.

This report should be considered a preliminary survey of Yukon game management. Four months' time enabled the researcher to read through some 30 cubic feet of old files, dozens of current files and numerous titles and reports held by the Archives. The researcher was able to have brief interviews with many long-time Yukon residents.

The terms of reference for the research set out some 13 specific areas of research, each of which deserve more thorough treatment. The researcher took the liberty of adding trapping and fur farming to the list and deleting the role of the Canadian Wildlife Service and a review of the effectiveness of the Scientist and Explorers Ordinance. As the work proceeded, the researcher learned of current Game Branch problems. Consequently some of the research is presented so that these current problems are set in a historical context. The researcher accepts complete responsibility for all conclusions, opinions, errors and omissions.

I wish to thank Game Branch personnel for giving me their cooperation in this work, especially Betty Gautier who prepared the manuscript and the tables. The Yukon Archives was of great help for research on the early years. Last but most important I wish to thank the many oldtimers who talked with me. They should understand that I did not have time to obtain the whole story, and that I hope to be back to do just that before too long.

Rob McCandless
January 7, 1977

Chapter 1

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF GAME LAW

Before the Gold Rush

Long before the Klondike Discovery, miners, traders and explorers had passed through the Yukon. Generally they took all the game that they needed when they needed it. Many of these miners and traders more or less settled in the Yukon, but since their numbers were only a few hundred prior to 1896 it is doubtful if their essentially unregulated hunting had an effect on game populations or habitat.

The fur industry had been established early in the nineteenth century by the Hudson's Bay Company in the Mackenzie River valley.¹ The Company attempted to establish posts in the Yukon as well, but with only limited success. The Hudson's Bay Company was nearly 200 years old by this time and quite fixed in its manner of operation such as trading rituals, the kinds of trade goods offered and pelts sought. The Company was not a particularly disruptive influence on Yukon wildlife populations. However its monopoly was threatened by Russian and American competition with their shorter lines of communication. The withdrawal of the Hudson's Bay Company created room for independent traders who were quick to establish debt systems in their trade with Indians. The consequences of this system on the trapping industry will be discussed later.

In 1894 Ottawa began preparing legislation to protect the game resources in the Northwest Territories, which included at that time the Yukon and all areas west and north of Manitoba. G.M. Dawson and William Ogilvie were two Federal civil servants who had travelled extensively in the Yukon prior to 1894. The Minister of the Interior sought the opinions of these men and the Hudson's Bay Company. The result was the Northwest

Game Act of 1894.²

Speaking in the House of Commons, the then Minister said,

*"...the only thing we can do is prevent these animals being shot for pleasure by others than the inhabitants...it is impossible to make the bill more stringent (towards Indians) unless we are prepared to feed these people."*³

Discussion of the Northwest Game Act in the House of Commons revealed that the Act was patterned on the game law of Ontario. One speaker urged the Minister to introduce bag limits and licences into the Act as was the practice in Nova Scotia at that time. Mr. Daly replied that the closed season was in itself sufficient to preserve game. It is possible that the Act was the only means whereby Ottawa could save the bison or buffalo from complete extinction. In any case the Act introduces certain concepts of game management that would survive in succeeding legislation in the Yukon for decades.

The Northwest Game Act was law for the Yukon Territory at the time of the discovery of gold in the Klondike in 1896. The arrival of thousands of gold seekers and their demands for self-government led to the passing of the Yukon Act in 1898 and the creation of the Government of the Yukon Territory. However, the Northwest Game Act still applied in the Yukon until the Territory was granted the right to legislate over its game resources in July 1900.⁴ It was also at this time that the Territory was granted power to elect two members to the Territorial Council. The new Territorial Council approved its own game ordinance and on January 19, 1901, assent was given to An Ordinance Respecting the Preservation of Game in the Yukon Territory.⁵

The Yukon Game Ordinance 1901-1920

The first game ordinance appears to be patterned on the Northwest Game Act but differs significantly in several ways. It had no closed seasons on fur bearing animals and changed the seasons on big game, as shown in Table 8. It introduced bag limits for the first time and required the reporting of game killed to R.N.W.M. Police. Game populations must have been different from later years or there was confusion as to big game species, because the ordinance prohibits hunting bison or buffalo, limits deer to six, elk to two, and has no limitations at all on caribou as to season or bag limit. The Ordinance created game guardians who were granted power to search "any bag or other receptacle, vehicle or other means of transportation", however searching "any tent, or on any premises, or on board of any vessel, or at any other place"⁶ by a constable (not a game guardian) required a warrant from a Justice of the Peace.

The Ordinance had other sections of interest when compared to modern law. Failure to use game meat for food risked a penalty of up to \$500 or a three month jail term. That fine represents about 100 days' wages, or about \$5,000 today.⁷

"Explorers, surveyors, prospectors, miners and travellers" were exempt from bag limits and seasons, as were Indians. The Commissioner in Council was granted power to alter seasons but not bag limits or any other provision.

The Game Ordinance changed in many ways in the years following until the major revision in 1920. In fact, the game ordinance has been revised in some way at virtually every session of the Territorial Council for the past 75 years, a record that surpasses that of any other Yukon law. In the fall of 1901 Council raised the bag limit on moose to six per year and liberalized penalties regarding seasons, reporting of kill

and bag limits on caribou, sheep and goats.⁸

The 1908 amendment made many changes and introduced several new concepts to the Ordinance. Only males of big game species could be taken. Non-resident hunters were required to purchase a licence for \$100 and make a sworn declaration as to their kill. They were also required to obtain an export permit from the Commissioner to ship their trophies home. The Commissioner obtained power to set aside certain areas of the Territory as being exempt from application of the ordinance "in order to provide sustenance for isolated camps"⁹ and to licence hunters to provide for said (isolated) district. This is the first appearance of the granting of power to vary the application of the game ordinance over any part of the Territory. From 1908 until 1920 the Yukon Territorial Council made only minor changes to the Game Ordinance. In 1918 the complete protection given to bison was extended to beaver.¹⁰

In the years prior to 1920 fur farming had become an important Yukon industry. The Fox Protection Ordinance (1914)¹¹ and the Fur Export Tax Ordinance (1919)¹² granted the Yukon Government unprecedented authority over its fur industry. Certain types of fox had become extremely valuable and elaborate safeguards appeared in the law to protect the livelihood of Yukon trappers and fur farmers. Fox farmers had to register, could not export live foxes unless they had been in captivity for two years, had a 25 yard 'deadline' declared around pens and so on. The Fur Export Tax was the government's attempt to collect some of the economic rent arising from the sale of fur. Royalties per pelt were set at approximately 5% of the pelt's market value, so the schedule had to be changed often. The Fur Export Tax Ordinance is still in Yukon law while the Fox Ordinance was absorbed into the Game Ordinance.

The Game Ordinance 1920-1941

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1920 was much different from that of earlier years.¹³ It boasted 44 sections on 16 pages as compared to 25 sections on 5 pages of the earlier law, indicating that game was the most valuable resource over which the Yukon had complete control. The Ordinance created new classes of licences; for market hunting, big game guiding and the fur trade. Indians were exempted from most parts of the Ordinance except those restricting killing of females and protected species, sale of game and prohibited uses of game. For these offences Indians faced the same penalties. This new Ordinance together with the two fur ordinances mentioned above gave the Territorial Government a firm grip on the game resources of the Yukon.

Market hunters were licenced at \$25.00 per year. These hunters and no others were permitted to hunt male moose and caribou over one year old and sell the meat at any time of year without restriction, except that the hunters were required to report their kills to a game guardian. These hunters could sell only to licenced dealers, who in turn were required to furnish annual reports.

The Ordinance created a licencing system for Chief Guide, Assistant Guide and Camp Helper without specifically requiring non-resident hunters to hire guides while hunting in the Territory. Fur Traders licences were of two kinds, resident at \$25 per year and non-resident at \$150. The Commissioner and his designates were the licencing authorities, thus they obtained considerable influence in determining the level of competition in the fur industry.

The 1920 Ordinance set open seasons for lynx, marten, mink, otter and muskrat and re-opened a season on beaver. All

hunters were required to report their kills of moose, caribou, deer, sheep and goat. Raw hides could not be exported without a permit. The old sections respecting the Commissioner's powers over seasons or bag limits and the game guardians' rights of entry and seizure were not altered. The 1920 game guardian was not a constable unless he was also an R.N.W.M.P. constable and could not make an arrest.

The 1920 Ordinance lasted a year in its original form before being subjected to 14 separate amending ordinances before 1938. The amendments show a trend from general prohibitions to specific prohibitions, reductions of bag limits, and a broadening of the licencing requirements. A selection of these changes includes the following. References are not cited since the amending ordinances are brief.

- separation of the Yukon into two zones for purposes of setting the open season on muskrat (1921) and beaver (1923)
- Indians expressly forbidden to become Chief Guides and required to observe closed seasons on fur bearers (1923)
- non-resident hunters required to hire guides (1933)
- fur farms allowed to feed moose meat to animals for one year (1925) and to feed male caribou without restriction (1926)
- bag limit of six bear imposed (1928) and removed (1933)
- licenced meat hunters exempted from reporting their kills (1931)
- hunting licence required for all residents (1933)
- Fox Protection Ordinance included in the Game Ordinance (1937)
- introduction of resident and non-resident Trappers Licence (1937)
- beaver and marten protected for three years (1937)

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1938¹⁴ made no substantive changes to the law regarding game animals but made important changes to the trapping industry. Anyone trading in furs

had to be licenced and he had to trade at a designated trading post. This law plus the established credit practices (always termed "Jawbone" in the Yukon Territory) made the fur trading in isolated areas a monopoly situation. In an effort to prevent abuses, R.C.M.P. and Indian Agents were granted powers to examine fur traders' books. Game guardians obtained power to arbitrate in trapline boundary disputes, with appeal to a Justice of the Peace, but they did not have direct power to assign areas to trappers. Game guardians obtained greater discretionary powers in the 1938 Ordinance. The 1920 sections on searching of vehicles and premises remained intact. Added to these was a section which permitted game guardians to seize on view materials used in violation of the Ordinance. The years from 1920 to 1941 saw the Yukon Game Ordinance evolve from essentially a list of prohibitions into a law that endowed the Territorial Government with complete powers over both the economics and the conservation of game.

Game Law in Recent Past 1942-1971

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1938 received four amendments during the Forties that deserve mention. In 1942 the Comptroller (Commissioner) obtained power to issue residents hunting licences to "U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Government Public Roads Administration" personnel while engaged in the construction of the Alaska Highway.¹⁵ A 1944 amendment extended this privilege to R.C.M.P., Canadian Army and government personnel of both the Federal and Territorial governments, all in exception to the 1938 requirements of a two-year residency.¹⁶ It is widely believed in the Yukon today that the influx of construction personnel severely depleted game stocks adjacent to the Alaska Highway.

Other game ordinance amendments are significant in relation to the Alaska Highway. Amendments in 1943 permitted the Comptroller to make regulations for the protection of game animals, birds and fur bearers one mile on either side of the Alaska Highway with penalties for violation up to \$500 or six months in jail.¹⁷ The third important amendment of 1943 created the Kluane Game Sanctuary, later enlarged to its present borders.^{18,19} A 1945 amendment extended complete protection to deer, elk, pheasant, and to beaver for three years.

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1947 replaced that of 1938.²⁰ It changed many of the old sections and added new provisions. "Outfitter" became a new class of licensee defined as one who
"carries on or who is engaged in or concerned in the business of lending, renting or letting for hire any saddle horse, pack horse, vehicle, boat or other equipment for the purpose of being used in the hunting or taking of any big game...."

With this new requirement licencing extended to every activity connected with Yukon game. The Comptroller could not specifically limit the number of licenced outfitters, nor could he assign any territory to any outfitter. However, the Comptroller could require the potential outfitter to own necessary and sufficient equipment to manage six hunters in the field. The residency of the hunters was not specified. Big game guides had two classes of licence, Chief Guide and Assistant Guide, and for the first time guides were not permitted to kill game while employed.

Game guardians obtained expanded discretionary powers under the 1947 Ordinance. They became constables, with the power to arrest. They could now prosecute up to three years after an offence had been committed. The Comptroller obtained new definitions of his powers to make regulations. Earlier ordinances in general had not granted the Comptroller power to set aside any part of the law or any part of the Territory: those things could have been done only with the approval of Council. In 1947 the Comptroller could make regulations under some 21 different classes, some of which were to

- designate parts of the Yukon as game preserves or sanctuaries.
- register trap line districts and trappers within it, also vary the seasons and bag limits in each district.
- regulate the sale of game meat.
- regulate open seasons for all game animals, and bag limits for birds.
- regulate or prohibit the possession of firearms in any part of the Yukon.

This ordinance has one other feature of particular interest: it was applicable to Indians. Indians had no special rights save being able to hunt in game preserves and to sell meat to institutions. Otherwise Indians had to obtain licences

to carry on any activity connected with game.

The years from 1947 to 1958 saw no major change to the Game Ordinance and the concepts established in 1947. The 1951 amendments created the office of the Director of Game and granted to him many of the powers held by the Commissioner.²¹ Bears obtained protection under the ordinance. Game meat was finally totally prohibited from being sold. "No hunting" areas adjacent to the Alaska Highway included the Mayo-Dawson Road, but the width of the area was reduced from one mile to one hundred yards. Amendments in 1955 (1st Session Ch.25) stripped Game Guardians of their powers to search without warrant, but not their powers of arrest or seizure of game-related goods. Other amendments during the Fifties changed the definitions of guides and outfitters several times until the 1958 revision; they have not changed substantially since that time.

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1958 granted the Commissioner powers to make regulations respecting bag limits and seasons for all game animals.²² The ordinance became a licencing law only; the direct control of the Yukon's game resources passed to the Commissioner and his officers as regulatory authorities.

The Game Ordinance underwent many changes in both languages and concept in the years from 1958 to 1971, with the bulk of the amendments passed in 1967. The business of big game hunting evidently necessitated more changes in definitions and licencing requirements. The list of prohibited practices was updated. Game farming and wildlife photography became licenced businesses. The Commissioner became able to set licence fees by regulation. Probably the most important amendments were those of 1967, which restored the game guardian's discretionary powers that were taken away in 1955.

The 1976 Ordinance

The Yukon Game Ordinance of 1976 (R.O.Y.T. Ch. G-1, as amended) is the result of concepts in game management that have evolved in the Yukon during the past 75 years and are probably much older. It is interesting to compare the Yukon's law to that of Ontario in the year 1892. (Stat. Ont. 1892, Ch. 58). Sections such as closed seasons and bag limits; prohibited practices such as using snares, bait, poisons and permitting dogs to harass game; licencing non-residents and granting search powers to game guardians: these are ideas that have existed in our game laws for at least 84 years. Today's game law has these and other provisions to regulate hunting pressure on game species. Other functions are to regulate economic activity based on game, set out administrative and enforcement procedures and regulate habitat. Habitat is described in another section.

The Game Ordinance regulates certain economic activities concerning wildlife. Each person who derives a "discretionary" type of income from game, i.e. by his or her own efforts, on his or her own behalf; is granted a "monopoly" on the particular area where that person normally obtains this income. If this was not done, then two trappers for example could compete for fur in a particular spot, increasing the likelihood that the fur will be trapped out. The activity area of a particular trapper or big game outfitter is therefore registered under the Ordinance so that competition and increased pressure on wildlife is less likely to occur. This is effective regulation, but it may not be efficient as will be analyzed under sections on trapping and big game hunting.

The Game Ordinance sets out certain discretionary powers of game guardians or Conservation Officers to enable them to

enforce game laws. These powers are quite far-reaching as compared to those of police constables under Canada's Criminal Code, but they are quite comparable to those of game officers in other provinces. The Conservation Officer's powers arise from decisions of the Territorial Council or Legislature; consequently they may be exercised to the limit of what is politically acceptable. However, when one compares the penalties for violation of the game ordinance through the years from 1901 to 1976 one is struck by an obvious fact: the penalties for infractions of the Yukon Game Ordinance have not kept pace with the growing powers of enforcement.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. Tanner, Adrian; The Structure of Fur Trade Relations; M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1965.
2. 57-57 Victoria, ch. 31.
3. Hansard House of Commons, June 2, 1894
4. 63-64 Victoria ch. 34 (18 July 1900, Bill No. 190)
5. Ord. of Y.T. No. 2, 1901.
6. R.O.Y.T., ch. 72, S.7, 17.
7. Atlin miners formed a union in 1901 with a base rate of \$5.00 per day, described in W.W. Bisland, Brit. Col. Historical Quart. XVI, 1952.
8. Ord. of Y.T., No. 37, 1901.
9. Ord. of Y.T., ch. 6, 1908.
10. Ord. Y.T., 1918 ch. 5, S.3.
11. Ord. Y.T., 1914 ch. 8.
12. Ord. Y.T., 1919 ch. 8.
13. Ord. Y.T., 1920 ch. 1.
14. Ord. Y.T., 1938 ch. 1.
15. Ord. Y.T., 1942 ch. 7.
16. Ord. Y.T., 1944 ch. 9.
17. Ord. Y.T., 1943 ch. 4.
18. ibid, S.2.
19. Ord. Y.T., ch. 11.
20. Ord. Y.T., 1947, ch. 3.
21. Ord. Y.T., 1951 (2nd. Sess.) ch. 11.
22. R.O.Y.T. 1958, ch. 50.

Chapter 2

TRAPPING: THE MAINSTAY

Trapping has always been the mainstay of economic activity based on Yukon wildlife. Valuable Yukon furs lured European traders into the Yukon as early as the 1840's. Yukon Indians may have been able to obtain European goods before this time through trade with coastal Indians and their trading partners, the Russians and Americans. The Hudson's Bay Company probably initiated Yukon fur trade with gifts of tea and tobacco. U.S. Lieutenant Schwatka passed through the Yukon in the early 1880's and reported that the Indians wanted only tea and tobacco in trade.¹ By this time independent traders began to establish themselves along the Yukon River. The trade remained stable until the Gold Rush in 1896. The stampede disrupted the fur trade because many would-be miners became trappers. Some areas such as the Macmillan and Pelly Rivers may have been trapped out of marten and beaver by the turn of the century. Not until most of the stamperders had left did the fur trade become stable.

The Changing Economics

Gold and fur are the old roots of the Yukon economy. In fact in 1929 the Yukon derived \$20,572 from revenues under the Game Ordinance, most of this from trapping as shown in Table 2 in the Appendix. Total Yukon Government revenues from all sources such as business licences, property taxes and other direct taxes amounted to \$86,000 for that year.² Thus wildlife contributed 25% of government revenues in 1929, exclusive of Dominion grants. Total game ordinance revenues for 1975/76 are \$221,166 of which only \$3753 can be attributed to trapping. For comparison with 1929, today's game and fur revenues are only 1.70% of government revenue derived from direct taxation, totalling \$12,969,303 for fiscal year 1975/1976. Trapping as a source of revenue declined from 17% in 1929 down to .03% today.

Table 5 in the Appendix shows Yukon fur production and the fur export tax collected for all years from 1920 to 1976. There are no firm data for years prior to 1920; in any case the government neither managed the industry nor collected revenue from it until 1920.

The Fur Export Tax is a royalty or fee levied by the Territorial Government on a given pelt when it is exported from the Yukon. No pelt can be exported from the Yukon without having its tax or royalty paid. The original tax schedule set out so many dollars or cents per animal pelt with the tax amounts being close to five percent of the pelt's market value. The government revised the schedule frequently as can be seen in the right hand column of Table 5. Since 1971, the schedule has not kept pace with fur market values; for 1975, fur export tax revenue could be ten times as great.

The price of fur has varied a great deal through the years. Table 5 does not give the prices for individual pelts, only the total value of sales in a fiscal year and the number of pelts sold. There are great differences in fur values through the years. For example, muskrat is low compared to fox or lynx. However the crude factor - value of production over number of pelts sold for selected years - can demonstrate the instability of the fur market.

For Yukon trappers, the late Twenties were the best of times and the late Forties were the worst of times. Today the calculated value per pelt is close to the levels of the Twenties, but when inflation factors are accounted for, Yukon fur is still only half as valuable as it was in the heydays of the Twenties. Fur sales in the Twenties ranged between a low of three dollars and a high of nearly fifteen dollars per

average pelt. The arrival of the Depression caused a severe drop in fur prices, from nearly fourteen dollars down to two, a situation which lasted for nearly five years. From 1935 to 1948 average fur prices were fairly stable, ranging between four and seven dollars per pelt. Table 1 shows that currency inflation was not very great in those years.

The year 1948 saw the bottom fall out of the fur market. The 1946/1947 price per average pelt was six dollars; for 1947/1948 it was two and for 1948/1949 it was less than a dollar. Table 5 shows that the number of pelts taken per year tripled in those two years. It is plain that the trappers must have worked much harder to get fur, only to receive one-sixth of that fur's normal value. This is an effective loss in labour-time value by a factor of eighteen: for example, from \$180 per week down to \$10 per week. This was economic dislocation on the scale of a disaster, compounded by the currency inflation of the late Forties. It should be noted that most of the trappers were and still are, Indian.

Average prices per pelt hovered at about a dollar per pelt to 1958 then dropped again to the record low of sixty-five cents for the 1958/1959 harvest. From that year to 1972 prices recovered slowly. Average price per pelt then climbed to over ten dollars, settling at thirteen dollars for the last year of complete data, 1975/1976.

The above analysis of prices has one outstanding weakness in that it includes pelts of greatly differing value. Probably the 1948 market failure did not affect the muskrat hunters as greatly as it did trappers of lynx, fox and other furs, because the muskrat prices are lower to begin with. Analysis of the trends in harvests, species by species, would give a much sharper picture of the Yukon's fur economy since 1920.

Fur Farming in the Yukon

Fur farming in the Yukon started when prices for fox pelts climbed to record levels in the years prior to World War I. Game Branch files in the Yukon Archives for years before 1919 give little information. Fox farmers tried to breed the classic silver fox, black with silvery guard hairs, that was so much in demand at that time. They trapped, or purchased from trappers live pairs of foxes, then penned and bred them hoping for a pure strain. Prices higher than one thousand dollars for a pair of live silver foxes are sometimes recalled by old Yukon residents. One thing that encouraged fox farming was the availability and low cost of food. Farmers regularly fed game meat or fish to their animals. A letter written by the Yukon Commissioner in 1920 lists 10 fox farmers; at Dawson, Carcross, Carmacks, Forty Mile, Rampart and Whitehorse.³ The Fox Protection Ordinance (Ord. Y.T., 1914 C.8) gave special protection to fox farmers such as heavy penalties to prevent the export of live foxes that had not been in captivity for two years.

Fur farmers gained a special exemption in the game ordinance in a 1925 amendment that allowed them to feed game meat to their animals.⁴ A year later this was changed to caribou meat only. This privilege arose because the R.C.M.P. began to enforce laws requiring game meat to be used only for food, interpreting that as meaning human food.⁵ The fur farmers retained their special privilege until 1938 when it was withdrawn. Only three or four fur farmers at Carmacks were consistent in taking out the annual special permit the law required. In 1932 fur farmers Murray, Zimmer, Back and Best at Carmacks shot 41 caribou under permit.⁶ Since by 1932 the Yukon had a total of 35 fur farmers, the other 31 farmers fed their animals either fish or imported meals - or used game meat and neglected to take out permits.⁷

Frank Goulter at Carmacks used to catch gophers for mink food. He was persuaded to stop when he was told by an Indian, "Good grub, too good to waste, them."

Fur farmers at Tagish and Carcross have been accused of overharvesting fish in the lakes. Patsy Henderson made this accusation of the Barrett Brothers at Tagish in particular. In a 1932 letter to Indian Agent Hawksley at Dawson, Henderson said the Barretts "have 300 minks now will have close to 1300 after they have their youngs in a few days".⁸ The Barretts had evidently started to fish Little Atlin Lake, which was always the old people's trapping and fishing area and served as a resource "bank". The Indians appealed to Henderson, who was a famous man because of his Gold Rush experiences with his relative, Skookum Jim. The result of Henderson's petition is unknown; probably the R.C.M.P. acting as Fisheries Officers would have ordered the Barretts to cease fishing at Little Atlin by denying them a licence to do so. This incident illustrates the major problem of fur farmers, obtaining large amounts of low cost protein to use as food.

Fur farming in the Yukon seems to have peaked as a business in the late Twenties - early Thirties. In 1932 there were 35 licenced farmers as mentioned above. The number declined in the following years: 1935 - 20; 1938 - 14; 1943 - 9; 1957 - 1. The last fur farmer in the Yukon may have been H.S. White at Tagish in 1957, who quit and sold out in the late Fifties.⁹ There are no fur farmers in the Yukon in 1976.

Management of Fur Bearers

F.T. Congdon, Member of Parliament for the Yukon and former Commissioner, said in 1910:

"In the Yukon there are hundreds of square miles where I do not think you could now

find a single fur bearing animal. They have been absolutely exterminated by hunting, trapping or by the decrease of the food supply which occurred in the years 1904-5." 10

Congdon was referring to a period when the Yukon may have been depleted of fur bearers because of overharvest by miners turned to trapping, and by a severe decline in rabbit population prior to 1910. Big game hunters such as Selous, Sheldon and Armstrong describe trapping in those times in their books, which are referred to in the section on big game hunting. Selous said a trapper on the Macmillan took out 300 marten in the winter of 1904/5. Sheldon reported beaver had been trapped out of the Pelly by 1905. Armstrong described two trappers in the Macmillan near Moose Lake who took 242 marten in 1899, and one other trapper who took over 200 marten on the South Fork in 1900. He said that by 1908 trappers had abandoned the upper reaches of the Macmillan due to the scarcity of fur. The first World War started a resurgence in fur prices that in turn renewed trapping pressure in the valleys of the Pelly and the Macmillan.

Territorial Council approved a closed season on beaver for three years beginning in 1920.¹² The same game ordinance set closed seasons for lynx, marten, mink and otter from April 1 to November 15 and for muskrat from June 1 to December 1. A year later Council was asked to extend the complete closure to marten, but refused for the reason that marten were often caught in traps set for mink.¹³ The beaver season reopened in 1923 under new regulations protecting beaver lodges. However Council declared a three year closure on marten beginning in July 1924. This closure caused several complaints from areas such as Lansing and the Porcupine where trappers reported abundant marten that needed no protection.¹⁴ The closure on marten lasted until 1927.

The beaver season on the Mackenzie had been closed by 1928. Concerned over poached N.W.T. beaver reaching Yukon fur buyers, and a general decline in beaver population, the Commissioner proclaimed a new closed season on beaver in September 1928.¹⁵ Reaction was immediate. Taylor and Drury, merchants and fur traders, complained in a letter to the Commissioner that trappers were then on their way to the bush equipped for beaver, that T & D's purchased \$30,000 worth of beaver last year and "gave out thousands of dollars in credit which we shall have hard work to collect". The closure proclamation was promptly withdrawn, then re-issued in July 1929.¹⁶ In 1932, 51 trappers at Old Crow petitioned the Commissioner to reopen the beaver season because fur prices generally and particularly muskrat prices were low. Since it was illegal by then to shoot beaver, the trappers felt that beaver trapping by itself would not put a great pressure on populations.¹⁷ The beaver season reopened for the second time in late 1932. Beaver were protected by a third closed season proclaimed in 1946. Evidence of the closure is given in Game Branch biologist Bill Klassen's report on Fur Bearers of the Yukon Territory (unpublished, 1976). His graph of beaver harvest shows no Yukon production in 1947 and 1948. Game Branch files are missing for 1945 and 1946. Beaver harvesting resumed in 1949 under a new seal system: all pelts taken had to have an attached seal and seals were issued on the basis of the number of beaver lodges per trapline. The beaver were to be harvested in the spring hunt and taken by shooting. Not until 1962 did the winter beaver season reopen to conventional trapping.¹⁸ Despite a slow rise in beaver price from the lows of the Fifties, recent beaver harvests of one thousand or less are far below levels of three to four thousand in the Twenties and Thirties. As of December 1976, beaver appear to be abundant and even underharvested in the Yukon Territory.

Yukon fur harvests of the past five years are averaged by Game Branch Fur Technician and Administrator Joe Jack in Fur Activity in the Yukon Territory 1975 and 1976 (unpublished, mimeo). Lynx has been the most valuable fur in the total harvest value of about a quarter of a million dollars. Depending upon prices offered, the next four most valuable are muskrat, beaver, wolverine and marten. By comparison, in 1930/1931 muskrat was the most valuable, followed by marten, fox, lynx and mink.

The Game Branch feels that the Yukon's fur resources are underutilized. Production of furs can be increased by encouraging people to trap, particularly in times of firm fur prices. The value of furs can be increased by trapper education programs on fur preparation, care and grading. These programs can increase trapper earnings without necessarily increasing their harvests and are therefore sound management. In times of normal prices, Yukon furs could be worth in excess of a million dollars annually.

Indians and the Fur Trade to 1948

Frank Congdon, Former Commissioner and Yukon Member of Parliament said in 1910:

"One difference between hunting by trappers and by Indians is that, while the Indian....always leaves a stock of all the fur bearing animals in a district to continue the species, the white man does not. He goes into a "creek" and absolutely extinguishes all the individuals in it and therefore makes it impossible that it should be restocked from any individuals left in the district." 10

Generalizations such as this have their risks, but the evidence seems to be that as a group, Indian trappers are less likely to be influenced by economic or market pressures in trapping a certain area than are non-Indian trappers. The difference is not so much a cultural one as an economic one. There are

profound differences between the ways the two trappers, Indian and non-Indian, put values on the time they spend trapping. This difference becomes apparent to those considering the management of the Yukon's fur resources and the registration of trap lines.

Speaking before the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry, economist Mel Watkins said of northern peoples' fur industry,¹⁹

"The Indian was a commodity producer, not a wage earner, and the fur trade was literally a trade or a commercial activity; not an industrial activity...The Indian...was vulnerable to the needs of the trade but he did not have to make two critical and traumatic adjustments...He did not have to become a wage earner and he did not have to yield up his ownership of the land." (trapline)

"...For the student of economic history in general, no theme is so compelling as the process by which land-bound man is turned against his will into industrial man..." (wage earner)

Until the fur market collapse of 1948, virtually all the trappers were Indian. Not until 1937 did the Territorial Government bring in a licencing system for trappers, which applied in practice only to non-resident whitemen. Resident trapping licences cost two dollars, non-resident licences three hundred dollars.²⁰ Until after the Second World War, very few non-Indian residents engaged in trapping. Similarly until 1948 there were no trapline disputes between Indians, and only a few between Indians and non-Indians. These disputes usually arose out of Indian allegations that the non-Indian trapper was using poison.²¹

After the War a number of veterans took up trapping. With the fur market collapse of 1948, trappers were forced to double and re-double their efforts to get fur and finish the season with an income. More trappers plus more trapping meant that for the first time, the Indian trapper had to consider the

size and location of his or her trapline in relation to income, and competition for others. But the Indian continued to trap only to meet the needs of his or her family for goods; the ownership of traplines was never questioned.

Indian trappers used to trade furs for goods, not cash. For nearly a century, laws and trade practices seemed shaped to keep money away from Indians. Adrian Tanner's Masters Thesis The Structure of Fur Trade Relations (U.B.C., 1965) describes the relationship between Yukon Indian trappers and the traders. Beginning before the Gold Rush, independent traders extended credit to the trappers. This caused the trapper to make a long-term commitment to trapping and to rely less on other animals to meet his needs. Credit stabilized his economic relationship with the trader through times of fur price fluctuation. It also allowed the trapper to capitalize for the coming season or to acquire his outfit. Traders extended credit because it encouraged spending on goods, which in turn encouraged more trapping. The trader could influence the trade or purchase of certain goods over others, such as traps and ammunition over luxury goods. The trader could influence the kind of animal the trapper took quite apart from price by refusing to trade certain goods unless a certain fur was offered. Tanner wrote,

"In general the trader dictated the terms of trade and it was up to the trapper continuously to revise his ideas of what constituted reciprocity."

With a debt or "Jawbone" system no money ever changed hands. If one of Taylor and Drury's outposts ran out of trade goods it would issue tokens instead of money which were redeemable only at that outpost. The Territorial Government enhanced the monopoly trade system by requiring all fur dealers to have a post and trade only at that post. The Indian could not ship his furs out for cash or obtain information on outside fur

prices because the trader's post was invariably closely tied to the riverboats, winter roads, post office and telegraph. Keeping Indian trappers away from cash reflects a virtually ancient Canadian Government attitude that tries to maintain a "traditional" Indian existence separate and distinct from the modern. When one considers that the Territorial Government derived considerable revenue from trapping between the wars, it is not surprising that its fur management policies encouraged monopoly trade and a credit system.

Registration of Traplines

British Columbia instituted a system of trapline registration by 1926, copied by the Yukon some twenty-five years later. The 1938 Yukon Game Ordinance enabled game guardians to arbitrate in trapline disputes over rights to location. The 1947 ordinance required all trappers to be licenced but to qualify, applicants could not have some other "main occupation". Another section granted the Commissioner powers to create "registered trapline districts or fur rehabilitation blocks" where the fur harvest could be closely regulated by numbers, species and seasons. This appeared to be enabling legislation for the government to participate in an Indian Affairs-sponsored fur program. Trapline registration began with the Registered Trapline Regulations of January 1, 1952.

Trapline disputes before 1952 went to the local R.C.M.P. detachment to be solved. The R.C.M.P. attitude was to protect the long-time user against the newcomer. In 1939 the R.C.M.P. advised a would-be trapper "you are not allowed to encroach on the trapping area held by others".²² Comptroller (Commissioner) Jeckell was asked in 1943 about trapline registration in the Yukon, he replied that it was not feasible because large areas of the Yukon had not been mapped and funds were not available

to hire a game warden to supervise.²³ However Jeckell did correspond with British Columbia about that jurisdiction's trapline system, so such a program had been considered for the Yukon in 1943.

The B.C. system started in 1926. The registration program caused no difficulty between Indian and non-Indian trappers. There was no limit to the size of traplines so that the whole of the area need not be trapped every year. A one-mile no-trapping zone surrounded every trapline. Group traplines had met with early success but by 1943 some divisions had begun to appear in the various groups. The B.C. Game Commissioner said in his letter to Jeckell that the trappers tended to conserve rather than overharvest their fur bearers after the registration program was instituted.²⁴

In 1947 one newly-arrived Yukon resident purchased a trapline near Snag for \$600. Because this man bought his licence in Watson Lake, Whitehorse Territorial Agent Larry Higgins had no knowledge of the transaction and was concerned about any prior rights. Higgins kept a set of maps on which traplines were plotted as information was received from R.C.M.P. detachments at Carcross, Teslin, Champagne, Kluane and the White River districts. He wrote, "this confusion over traplines seems an inevitable and common occurrence and is due to a lack of knowledge of the geography of a region". Jeckell wrote to Higgins that prior location or rights must be established and the line had to be used every season by a bona fide trapper. The vendor of a trapline had no vested interest. Jeckell told the would-be trapper that his claim would be recognized only if no better claim was brought forward.²⁵

Director of Game Them Kjar started drafting trapline registration regulations in the winter of 1949/1950. His correspondence shows

that he consulted with Territorial Agents and the Yukon Fish and Game Association. In some way the draft regulations reached Ottawa. Director of Yukon Affairs R.A. Gibson wrote to the Commissioner expressing concern about the registration of Indian traplines. He enclosed a letter from D.J. Allan, Superintendent of Reserves and Trusts which asked that Indians be given a statement of preemptive right. The registration fee of ten dollars per year seemed high; especially since Indians had never considered that their rights to land could be questioned and usually had little cash. This correspondence shows that while Indian Affairs recognized the need to increase the yield of a trapline, they were sensitive to the position of the Indian trapper. By July 1950 Kjar was receiving petitions from Indian trappers in Teslin and Old Crow asking that the registration program be suspended.²⁶ It seems clear that trapline registration was imposed on Yukon trappers. It is regrettable that registration started when fur prices were low because many traplines may have been temporarily abandoned.

Traplines from 1951 to 1976

Trapline registration and renewals were subject to fur market fluctuations. Fur prices stabilized at relatively low values during the time registration began in the early Fifties. For fiscal year 1951/1952, 412 trappers registered their lines not including group lines at Old Crow, Peel River (Ft. McPherson people) and Ross River. By March 1954, 429 traplines had been mapped. Trappers with lines had to register annually and pay the \$10 fee. The trapping licence or General Hunting Licence was free to Indians. Holders of this licence could trap anywhere except a registered trapping area. Renewals declined in 1957 and 1958 because fur prices were very low, in fact at the lowest point in a hundred years. Many trappers simply

could not afford to pay the fee. In the case of Indians, Indian Agents would not authorize payment of the trapline renewal.²⁷ Unfortunately it was at this time, in the summer of 1958, that the Territorial Government started a new program of registration for a five year period.²⁸

The new ordinance required the holder of the certificate of registration to trap every year or forfeit his or her area. This kind of provision places a severe economic constraint on a trapper when fur prices are low as they were in 1958. First of all, the trapper may have to work at an unsatisfactory labour-time rate simply to hold his line. Secondly, if he normally derives all his cash income from trapping, low prices would force him to increase his efforts. His area may not be large enough. The result would be that he would try to obtain or use a larger area. Yukon trappers were caught in this dilemma in 1958. Many simply did not register their lines. By January 1959 re-registration was far from complete. The Legal Advisor told Game Director Bidlake that trapline registration could not be mandatory.²⁹ The provision requiring annual use of a trapline has never been enforced.

In the Yukon in December 1976, fur prices are on the upswing and there is considerable interest in trapping in the communities. The Territory has 387 trapline areas and three group areas; Old Crow, Ross River and Peel River (Fort McPherson). Thirty areas are not registered to anyone, and many other areas are registered to trappers who are not using them. Some trappers hold certificates but are unable to go trapping. The Game Branch is encouraging them to take on partners, or people holding "Assistant Trappers" licences and try to get the trapline in use.

The "ownership" and use of trapping areas are matters on

which policy has not been formed. Only about thirty percent of registered trappers are non-Indian. The Game Branch recognizes that its trapping and fur bearer policy will be in a state of change while Indian organizations form their own policy. Meanwhile the Branch is continuing its public education programs. Trapline registrations are granted only to those who have held Assistant Trappers licences. Registrations are granted for areas where the right to trap is not likely to be disputed by others at a later time.

From this analysis of the history of Yukon trapping it appears that any fur management policy must meet several objectives for trapping to equal its historical success. The policy should permit the holder of a trapline to have other sources of income and livelihood for periods of low fur prices. It should allow for differences between trappers such that a trapline area large enough for one man may be too small for another. In other words, the policy may require different classes of trapline proportional to size, isolation, harvest potential, trapper ability and other factors. The policy should require a minimum level of production over a long time period that is sensitive to fur price averages and to animal populations. Any public education program on trapping methods and fur care could include frequent, up-to-date fur market analyses and predictions. Finally, any fur bearer policy should seek to increase government revenues from the fur harvest to some percentage that is at least equal to historic levels, and that reflects the Game Branch's increasing concern with trapping as the Yukon's second most important renewable resource, after forestry.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Tanner, Adrian, The Structure of Fur Trade Relations; M.A. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1965.
2. Public Accounts for 1929.
3. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-3; June 1920.
4. Ord. Y.T. 1925, C.6.
5. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-5; April 1925.
6. ibid; File 12-11; June 1932.
7. ibid; February, 1932.
8. ibid; May 1932.
9. Central Records Game Branch Files box 5010; "Fur Farms".
10. Congdon, F.T.; Fur Bearing Animals of Canada (pamphlet) at the 1st. Ann. Meeting of the Commission of Conservation, 1910 in Archives Temporary Series 3; File 1910-8.
11. See Section 'Trophies or Meat, Part 1', The Gold Rush.
12. Ord. Y.T. Ch. 1.
13. Yukon Archives; Temporary Series 3; File 12-4, May 1921.
14. ibid; July 1924.
15. ibid; September 1928.
16. ibid; September 1928. July 1929.
17. ibid; August 1932.
18. Game Branch current File 3997-6; December 1962.
19. in Canadian Forum; Vol. LVI, No. 666 (November 1976); p.22.
20. Ord. Y.T. 1938, Ch. 1.
21. Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-11, June 23, 1932 (R.C.M.P. re Hogg, Old Crow); File 12-15, October 9, 1935 (Ind. Agent re non-Indian trapping, Liard); File 12-17, March 22, 1937 (R.C.M.P. vs. Geo. Dalziel, Beaver River); File 12-19, April 1940 (L. Brown, Mayo) etc.

22. ibid, File 12-19; October 1939.
23. ibid, File 12-20; October 1943.
24. ibid, File 12-20; January 1944.
25. ibid, File 12-22; January 1947.
26. ibid, File 12-23; March 1950.
27. Central Records Box 5015 File: 'Trapline Correspondence'
March 1958.
28. Ord. Y.T. 1958, Ch. 50.
29. Central Records; ibid; January 1959.

TROPHIES OR MEAT

Part One: 1896 to 1950

The Gold Rush

The Klondike discovery of 1896 led to an avalanche of humanity into the Territory and almost unbearable pressure on the game and fur resources. The Royal North West Mounted Police had the responsibility of preserving law and order and many other duties, such as making collections and reports on behalf of the Dominion Government. They were short-handed, ill-paid and virtually unable to protect the game resources and their habitat.

RNWMP Inspector Harper, writing in Dawson in January 1899, said:

"A great many moose were brought to town during the past summer and sold from butcher shops in town, also lately ptarmigan, grouse and rabbits have been abundantly exhibited in front of the different restaurants and butcher shops. The Game Ordinance was not enforced here last summer. This I think was a mistake as if the quantity of moose that was brought in last summer is brought in every year, very few will shortly exist in the country....." 1

Other detachments reported that virtually every mile of timber along the Yukon River was burnt during 1898, that Indians were forced to go up to 20 miles to hunt, that there was a general widespread decline in game and fur bearers. In theory the Yukon's game animals were protected by the Northwest Game Act² which set closed seasons; but not until 1902, when the Yukon Game Ordinance³ was passed, did the police enforce the law and obtain a conviction.

The world outside soon heard of the Yukon's relative abundance of game. The first visitors to the Yukon with an interest in hunting were Charles Sheldon and F.C. Selous, each of whom published books on their experiences in 1904 in the Pelly-MacMillan River country. Selous' book Recent Hunting Trips in British North America (London, Witherby & Co., 1907) made a number of comments about the management of Yukon game. He singled out meat hunters and trappers - both Indian and non-Indian - as being very destructive to the game, while presenting the big game hunters' unique, almost proprietary interest in keeping the game free from competitive predation. Sheldon, in The Wilderness of the Upper Yukon (N.Y., Scribner's, 1911) makes similar comments on what he judged to be pressures on the game population while candidly admitting he shot 7 sheep in a week. By contrast, RNWMP Superintendent Snyder reported of 1904 that there was "an enormous slaughter" of game on the upper Yukon and urged the imposition of a heavy tax on sportsmen of other countries.⁴ Four years later the Yukon Territorial Government instituted licences for non-residents at \$100.00 each.

Game meat was freely available for sale in the Yukon for 50 years, from 1897 to 1947. Early accounts and photographs reveal that the meat market was a *laissez-faire* situation with all varieties of meat available and sold. The game meat was intended to compete with beef on the Dawson market, but with the proviso after 1902 that each meat hunter had to take his animals in season. There was no shortage of beef or other imported meats at prices estimated between 25 and 50 cents per pound in the years prior to World War I.

It may be useful to estimate the game meat consumption in the early years. Dawson's population declined so rapidly in the years following 1901 that the Commissioner ordered the police

to keep their census data secret.⁵ The police did, however, report the numbers of livestock imported and the numbers of people leaving. Estimating Dawson's population in 1904 - 05 at 8,000 and using the RNWM Police meat import data for 1904 (2,248 cattle, 3,154 sheep, 245 hogs),⁶ one can estimate that Dawsonites consumed about 140 pounds of imported meat per year.⁷ By contrast, Canada's per capita meat consumption is 156 pounds, carcass weight.⁸ It is likely that people in Dawson in the years 1900 - 1906 relied on game meat for at least one-third of their meat.⁹ Thus the 8,000 estimated residents could consume 50 pounds of game meat per person per year, or 400,000 pounds.

The above figures are crude estimates because the population of Dawson City is unknown. The figure of 8,000 could be plus or minus 2,000 people. Thus the game meat consumption could vary between 300,000 and 500,000 pounds per year. Secondly, both caribou and moose would be sold in Dawson stores, in proportions that would vary according to how close the caribou migrated to Dawson. More reliable data is available for the Twenties, when the newly-licenced market hunters and game dealers made returns. Collecting all these assumptions for Dawson in 1904 and adding one more; that the game meat sold was in equal proportions, moose and caribou, one can estimate the game consumption at 400 ±100 moose and 1540 ±480 caribou, per year.¹⁰

Years of Equilibrium

The years between the Wars were stable ones for the Yukon. The population increased by less than 1,000 people from 1921 to 1941. Territorial Council passed a new Game Ordinance in 1920 that recognized the importance of protecting the game and fur resources of the Yukon and made them a source of revenue as well. New categories of licences appeared for

resident meat hunters, fur traders, guides and assistant guides, in addition to the old licencing requirements for non-resident hunters. The Twenties were a period of heightened awareness about game, and not just in the Yukon.

The Commissioner's Game Files for those years contain correspondence from all over North America; from other governments, from Fish and Game associations, publications, and interested individuals. These letters were requests for copies of the game regulations for the most part, or appeals for maps and more information on the Yukon. The Twenties were years of very strong fur prices and Yukon furs were much in demand; in fact fur buyers beseiged the Commissioner for names and addresses of Yukon trappers. The correspondence shows that most jurisdictions in North America were acutely conscious of wildlife, especially waterfowl, and the desire to keep to the terms of the then-new Migratory Birds Treaty. This heightened awareness has not been duplicated until the pollution-consciousness of the Seventies.

The Twenties were a time of good communication between the Yukon Territorial Government and adjacent jurisdictions: Alaska, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. The various officials attempted to eliminate differences in game laws that could lead to smuggling of furs over the borders. The Yukon possessed and exercised complete autonomy in matters respecting game. Consequently there were several occasions when the Commissioner was asked to explain certain provisions in Yukon game law that conflicted with the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, and its regulations concerning game in the Northwest Territories. Ottawa took particular and repeated exception in those wildlife-conscious days to the Yukon's continued market hunting and even worse, the feeding of game meat to animals in fur farms. The

Commissioner always replied that he would discuss the matter with the Territorial Council, then later he would write to say that the Councillors decided to leave the Ordinance unchanged. Evidently the game population was holding its own and in fact, had quite recovered from the effects of the Gold Rush.

Market Hunting Between the Wars

The new Game Ordinance of 1920 required licences for game market hunters and for dealers that sold the meat. The Ordinance required game guardians throughout the Territory to take statements from the licenced hunters as to when and where each animal was killed. No bag limit or season applied to these hunters, the only conditions on them were that they could shoot only males and that as always, they could not waste the meat. These licences cost \$25.00 which would be at least one hundred of today's dollars. The ordinary Yukoner did not need a licence to hunt until 1934.

The Ordinance required game dealers to make a return or statement also when they came to renew their licence for the year. Yet another provision of the 1920 Ordinance required all game guardians to make an annual return stating when, where and by whom every big game animal was killed. It appears that if these requirements were followed the economy of game meat could be fully calculated and understood: unfortunately, compliance was irregular and incomplete. The early enthusiastic record keeping soon grew desultory except in the isolated detachments such as Ross River and Old Crow.

One thing becomes clear immediately. A majority of the licenced market hunters in the Twenties and Thirties were Indians. Most of the reports by dealers on their purchases name Indians. Virtually all the animals reported killed near the smaller communities were reported by Indians.

At Ross River the R.C.M.P. maintained such careful records that the total annual game harvest can be plotted, month by month and place by place. The average annual harvest in the region was 490 moose, 306 caribou and 94 sheep. The Ross River records by themselves have two important implications. First, they show that it may be possible to obtain a complete record of the game harvest in a given area. Secondly, they show that for land claims purposes at least, Ross River Indians used a lot of territory in their hunting.

When the 1920 Ordinance came into force, 81 meat hunters' licences were sold. In 1922 the number dropped to 39. In 1923 the number sold - 25 - was the base level which held more or less for 10 years. In the Thirties and early Forties the number declined to between 10 and 15 market hunters. Obviously some hunters could not recover their expenses from the meat they sold and abandoned that livelihood. Individual returns by hunters are incomplete for the twenty-year period. Those available show that the average hunter shot about a dozen animals each year, but there were one or two who shot literally scores of caribou from the Sixty Mile herd when they got the opportunity.

Records for one hunter at Whitehorse, known to be an Indian, showed that in 1922 he shot 8 moose in the Marsh Lake area and in the same year sold 3,785 pounds of moose meat to P. Burns and Co. at Whitehorse, by their annual declaration for the renewal of their dealer's licence. Similar analyses could be made for many other market hunters in other communities.

The year 1921 will be used for another estimation of the game meat economy because the population of Dawson was reported in the 10-year Dominion census at 975 persons, and because the game dealer's returns seem to be complete. Dawson had

4 dealers selling game that year. Their returns show 7,100 pounds of moose and 3,600 pounds of caribou purchased from hunters. British Yukon Navigation Co. Ltd. records show that its steamers landed an average of 50 cattle a year in Dawson during the Twenties, with minor amounts of sheep and hogs.¹² Adding the figure for game meat, and for cattle at 450 pounds per animal gives an estimated 33,200 pounds of meat sold in Dawson in 1921.

Dawson's 1921 population was 975 persons. The total weight of meat calculated above and divided by 975 gives a per capita consumption of 33 pounds. However, as stated elsewhere, all Canadians consume an average of 156 pounds of meat per year. All things being equal, the average Dawsonite needed at least another 123 pounds of meat in that year, which one can assume was supplied from game. A calculation similar to the one described in note 10 gives an extra game meat consumption of 117,433 pounds, or 117 moose and 436 caribou - in addition to the equivalent of 20 moose and 280 caribou sold by market hunters.

In summary, one can make certain conclusions about market hunting in the Yukon during its years of importance. It was important to Indians as a means of supplementing their earnings but could not be considered as a livelihood for anyone. Waechter Bros. Co. of Dawson declared that they purchased moose at prices of between 12 and 20 cents per pound in 1925. Thus, several day's work to locate, kill and transport 2 moose carcasses might earn a game hunter between \$40.00 and \$60.00. Probably the dealer placed an order with the hunter, depending on his available stocks and freezer space. The calculations made above on Dawson's meat consumption show that store-bought game was not an important source of domestic meat in Dawson at least.

Market hunting declined in the Thirties and early Forties. In 1944 only one licence was sold. In 1947 the practice was made illegal, except that Indians were permitted to sell game to institutions, missions and hospitals.¹³ Finally in 1953, even that aspect of the sale of game was abolished, and it became illegal to serve game as food to the public except in Ross River and Old Crow.¹⁴ The reasons for ending the practice are not clear. Certainly nobody made money at it and it could hardly be considered a pressure on the game resources. Probably it was a matter of changing style in game management, where big game animals changed from being perceived as a locally-utilized resource into an export commodity - big game trophies.

Early Years of the Big Game Industry

The Yukon Territory first imposed non-resident big game licences in 1908.¹⁵ In the years from 1908 to 1920 the number of alien hunters coming to the Territory cannot be determined since the annual Public Accounts tabled in Territorial Council concealed the revenue from licences in the larger category of "Local Taxation and Sundry Revenue". However, we can gain an impression of the industry by referring to books published by early sportsmen such as Martindale (1913), Auer (1914), Young (1919), Maguire (1921) and Armstrong (1937).¹⁶

These books show that the White River district was famous for the quantity and size of its big game animals at the time of World War I. In those days big game parties would book nearly a year in advance and plan to spend several months in the Yukon. These parties would book with residents living in the Kluane or Whitehorse area. The trip recounted by G.O. Young is the most interesting because his party began at McCarthy, Alaska and ended at Whitehorse nearly three months later. Young was

guided by Morley Bones, and refers to Charles Baxter of Whitehorse as the first to take a party into the White River area from Whitehorse in 1918. The area had been known in earlier years from exploration for copper and placer gold from Alaska. Young's party included Eugene Jacquot, Johnnie Frazier, Paddie Smith, Willie Slimpert and other longtime residents of the Kluane area. All these men were active in the guiding business for the next twenty or thirty years. The other books of this period name Albert Isaac, Jim Baker, Shorty Chambers and Tom Dickson as being in some way connected with big game guiding near Kluane at this time. Maguire's book is the only one to mention costs, other than licences. He quotes (p.196) a cost of up to \$2,500.00 per hunter for a 40-day hunt out of McCarthy, Alaska. Yukon figures would be similar. The number of hunters in the years 1918 - 1920 was probably not more than a dozen per year for the whole Yukon.

The 1920 Game Ordinance licenced guides for the first time and the Public Accounts of 1921 are the first to show breakdowns of monies collected by licence type. For the 10 years from 1921 to 1930 an average of 24 non-residents hunted in the territory each year. Licence fees for guides, assistant guides and camp helpers, \$20, \$10, and \$5 respectively, are hidden in one total for each of these years. By estimating a party as one guide, two assistants and two helpers, one can use \$50 as a total licence fee for a hunting 'party'. Licence fees for guides averaged about \$200 per year for 1921 to 1930. Thus for the same ten-year period an average of four parties were equipped each season. Note that this seems to indicate 6 or more hunters per party, which is probably too high. The disparity reflects the fact that certain Indians from Fort Yukon, Alaska, would pay the non-resident fee to be able to hunt and trap in the Old Crow area.¹⁷

Correspondence between Territorial Agent Larry Higgins at Whitehorse and the Commissioner at Dawson are a valuable source on the business of big game in the Twenties and Thirties.¹⁸ In October 1926 Higgins wrote that 17 hunters came to the Yukon in 1926 and that the usual guide charges would be \$4000 to \$5000 for a party of two hunters. When accommodation, transportation and purchases are included, "it would be safe to say that two hunters leave in the Yukon from \$6500 to \$7000". He wrote in a similar letter in October 1928 that two hunters would pay \$4600 for a 60-day hunt and three hunters \$6000. He lists as chief guides, Charles Baxter, the Jacquot brothers, A.R. Auston, H.O. Lokken, A. Coward, F. Zimmerlee and Johnny Johns.

Johnny Johns is an Indian. His name first appears in Game correspondence in July 1923 as a camp helper, and he says that his association with big game began in 1917.¹⁹ In October 1925 his name and that of Billy Smith of Carcross appear as applying for licencing as Chief Guides, but Territorial Agent Higgins was informed that since the Game Ordinance does not apply to Indians, neither do the licencing privileges. Johns re-applied in June of 1926 including a list of his camp equipment and horses. Evidently he was successful that year, for in August 1927 Agent Higgins wrote to the Commissioner requesting that he not grant Chief Guide licences to Indians. *"It really means the taking away the livelihood of guiding from the white man if any more Indians are granted the privilege of acting as Chief Guides."*²⁰

This unfortunate attitude was to persist for years. The Commissioner replied to an enquiry in May 1933 that "every non-resident hunter must be accompanied by a licenced white Chief Guide".²¹ Teslin Indian George Johnson had his year-old

application turned down in June 1934 because he had no horses. Johnson was famous for his success as a trapper at that time, having brought the first automobile to Teslin in 1928.²² Having a licence he could easily buy horses in Whitehorse but saw no use for horses in Teslin, without the licence! In 1941 Billy Hall of Squanga Lake was turned down.²³ It was customary for the Commissioner to ask the local RCMP detachment to advise him of the applicant's suitability. In both cases their reports were favourable. Perhaps Commissioner Jeckell felt that traditional hunting rights would conflict with the requirement of a Chief Guide to act as a Game Guardian, even though Yukon Indians had been involved in the business as early as Auer's account of his hunt of 1914.¹⁶

Extensive revisions to the Game Ordinance of 1933 required non-resident hunters to retain a licenced guide to hunt in the Yukon. The same amendment for the first time required all hunters to take out licences at one dollar each, with free licences for Indians. The big game industry declined about this time, probably as a result of the Depression. In the twelve years from 1931 to 1943 an average of ten non-resident hunters came to the territory each year, with only two or three guiding parties booking.

Territorial Agent Higgins at Whitehorse used to reply to most enquiries regarding big game hunting during the extended period from 1925 to 1946, and frequently advised the Commissioner on these matters. He wrote in 1932 that Chief Guides available were Chas. Baxter, Gene and Louis Jacquot, Johnny Johns, A. Brown, A. Coward, I. Van Bibber and H. Lokken.²⁴ By 1940 the list included only Johns, Baxter, Coward and the Jacquot brothers.²⁵ After the war only Johns and the Jacquots are listed. Higgins wrote to Commissioner Jeckell in 1940 that in 1939 and 1940, 10 hunters had total expenditures of about \$12,000 in the Yukon.²⁶

This is far below his estimate made in 1926, where hunters might spend over \$3000 each.

The War Years

The Yukon's relative isolation from the Second World War ended with the construction of the Watson Lake airport in 1941. This was part of the Northwest Staging Route, a series of airports which preceded the building of the Alaska Highway. In a letter in March 1941, General Construction Co. Ltd. of Vancouver requested a licence to take moose to feed its crews building the airport.²⁷ They were told that licences could not be issued to a corporation, and would they please supply a name. Later the company said they would fly beef in from Whitehorse instead. A similar request was relayed through Agent Higgins concerning the Canol Project. Commissioner Jeckell replied in a letter:

"It should be made clear to the Corporation engaged in survey or construction of Canol Project No. 1 that it is not desired that a large part of men be supplied with game to comprise wholly their meat diet, and I do not consider it adviseable to issue special licences under Section 22 (meat hunters licence) in such numbers that will permit the killing of game over a large part of the Territory, and thereby deprive the natives of their main food supply." 28

During the height of Alaska Highway construction there was widespread concern throughout the continent about the safety of the game resources of the Yukon and of Alaska. That this concern was justified is still not clear. Certainly the police were alerted, but being short-handed as always their patrols may not have been extensive. There were only about a half dozen prosecutions for violations of the Ordinance in the middle Forties that could be directly related to the Alaska Highway according to R.C.M.P. reports filed with the Commissioner. Personnel

building the highway obtained resident hunting licences through an enabling amendment of 1942, even though many of them were United States citizens.²⁹ On the other hand, the next year the Commissioner obtained powers to declare a 2-mile wide 'no shooting' zone along the Alaska Highway, and the same bill created the Kluane Game Sanctuary.³⁰ In 1943 the Acting Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said of the Alaskan game situation near the Highway "the conditions do not justify alarm."³¹

This widespread concern is amply demonstrated by the correspondence between the Commissioner and various department heads at Ottawa. For example, a U.S. Army private wrote his home in the fall of 1942 from his camp in the Kluane area. He said that the camp cookhouse had served mountain sheep meat that others in his unit had shot. His letter was intercepted and copied by the censor, probably in Alaska. This copy went to consecutively, the U.S. Dept. of the Interior, the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, and then into Canada and the desk of the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P., before reaching the Yukon Commissioner a few hundred miles from its point of origin. Commissioner Jeckell replied that "privileges granted to American Army personnel in the Yukon are sufficiently generous that it is quite likely fresh meat such as referred to would be obtained legally."³²

Similar concern appears in letters from Alaska inviting Yukon participation in game management conferences on the highway's effects; letters from the Director of Yukon Affairs at Ottawa expressing renewed concern about the effects of market hunting and a rapidly expanding population on game; and very significantly, a letter from the U.S.-based International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners expressing concern about possible river pollution from effluent

from the new Whitehorse oil refinery.³³ Again it is not clear if their concern was justified. This would require many interviews with long-time residents. The concern does demonstrate, however, that the Yukon was famous for its wildlife, and as it turned out later, unprepared for a renewed interest in big game by non-resident hunters.

The Shade Brothers Crisis of 1946

Big game hunters re-discovered the Yukon in 1946: 70 hunters took out licences, the largest number ever to that time. But 38 of these hunters went with the Shade brothers of California who had discovered a loophole in the Game Ordinance and literally flew a DC-3 through it. Yukoners rallied around the Yukon Fish and Game Association. They had a new draft of the Game Ordinance before Council in the spring of 1947 and saw the loophole closed that summer. A new term - "outfitter" - was written into the law.

U.S. Lts. Carson and Earl Shade learned of the Yukon's potential while flying cargo to Fairbanks. After the War they advertised in Los Angeles and were soon able to get a plane full of American hunters on its way to the Yukon in August of 1946. They landed at Teslin and set off by road for the North Canol Road. Two weeks later they returned by air to Los Angeles, while yet another party was taken up the Canol Road. The 38 hunters taken by the Shades took 12 caribou, 16 moose, 12 sheep, 9 grizzly bear and 4 black bear. "To most of the hunters it was a disappointing outing and proved to be a fantastic advertising scheme conceived by Shade Brothers."^{34,35}

There were five other guiding parties during 1946: E. Jacquot with 11 hunters, J. Johns with 9, M. Nolan with 7, D. Hammond with 1 and J. Dickson with 4.³⁴ These men were contractors,

booking their parties in the manner used for the previous 25 years. The Shade brothers had introduced a new element by hiring licenced guides as employees. Thus a Yukon licenced Chief Guide would not himself collect the \$1,000 or whatever per hunter, he would receive only wages while his employer collected the difference.

It has been described how in previous years the administration kept the power to licence guides close to its chest. Sometime during the period June 1944 and September 1946 (for which the Commissioner's Game File is missing from the Yukon Archives holdings) the administration must have eased its discretionary powers over licences, because the Shade brothers were able to hire one or more Chief Guides. They were thereby able to comply with Section 84 (e) of the 1938 Game Ordinance requiring non-resident hunters to hire guides. However the same section allowed the Commissioner powers to permit non-residents to hunt without hiring a guide. Regardless of how it was done, the Shade operation was legal and it was a threat to the established guides.

The word "outfitter" is today taken as one who is:

"a bona fide owner of equipment in good condition and repair that in the opinion of the Director is sufficient to take care of such number of hunters in the field not being less than four as the Director may endorse upon the licence." 36

That is, the word "outfitter" has been substituted for the traditional legal use of the word "guide" or "chief guide" in the 27 years prior to 1947. In the Game correspondence prior to 1947 the word "outfitter" was invariably used as referring to merchants, or one who supplies or sells a hunter's personal "outfit". Thus the various Commissioners would always reply to requests for names of "outfitters" with a list naming

Taylor and Drury Co., Northern Commercial Co., Hudson's Bay Co., and Matthew Watson.³⁷ Letterhead used by the Jacquot Bros. of Kluane in 1946 shows that they styled themselves as "outfitters" but they also ran the Kluane Trading Post at Kluane, so both definitions could apply. The first use of the word "outfitter" as referring to a guide is in a letter from a James H. Bond to the Commissioner in June 30, 1947.³⁸ Bond was an American who had never hunted in the Yukon before. Much will be said about him later. From whatever source it came, "outfitter" came to be linked more closely to the word "guide" by the definition in the new Game Ordinance of 1947:

" Outfitter " means and includes any person duly licenced as such who carries on or who is engaged in or concerned in the business of lending, renting or letting for hire any saddle horse, pack horse, vehicle, boat or other equipment for the purpose of being used in the hunting, taking or killing of any big game or game bird."

39

The Yukon Fish and Game Association formed in February 1945 with its executive G.R. Bidlake, President; F.H.R. Jackson, Vice-President; and W.D. MacBride, Secretary-Treasurer. Initially the Society concerned itself with matters such as barriers to fish on the Alsek River, importation of birds and fish into the territory and other matters concerning game conservation. The Territorial Government, flush with wartime liquor revenues, awarded the Society a grant of \$500 a year beginning in 1946. By the end of 1946 the Society had 207 members. These and the following events are described in the correspondence of the Society with the Commissioner.⁴⁰

The executive of the Fish and Game Society met with Acting Comptroller (Commissioner) Gibben, George Black, M.P. and Inspector Cronkhite of the R.C.M.P. late in 1946 to discuss

the problem of the non-resident hunters. They were invited to propose revisions to the Game Ordinance. The Acting Comptroller received these suggestions after they were approved at a Fish and Game Association meeting in February 1947.

About this time two things occurred to hasten the concern to amend the Ordinance. First the Shade brothers wrote to "Larry Higgins, Assistant Controller" asking for advice on "any information that would affect our operation", as they were, in Game Association President Bidlake's words, "evidently planning to again invade the Territory with mass hunters". In the same letter to Gibben advising him of the Shade brothers' renewed interest, Bidlake said that the local Bank of Commerce had received money as advance payment to local guides to help them become "outfitters". These two events are startling because both the Whitehorse Territorial Agent and the manager of a local bank turned over privileged information to the Society to help them protect the existing big game guiding business by limiting competition.

The bank episode requires some expansion. An American industrialist wrote to the bank in January 1947 enclosing \$1000 as an advance to two Indians, to help them become Chief Guides under the existing (1938) Ordinance.⁴¹ He wanted to know if there were any legal impediments to this. However the manager instead of enquiring, released the import of the letter to the Fish and Game Association. Not until four months later, in June, did Agent Higgins enquire of the Comptroller if he could licence the Indians concerned. Meantime the new 1947 Ordinance was being debated by Territorial Council. Suddenly the industrialist and his party were due to arrive. Agent Higgins wired the Comptroller about his unanswered letter. The Comptroller wired back that under the new 1947 Ordinance proclaimed just days before, he could not

licence the Indians as they did not meet the new qualifications for Chief Guides. The industrialist arrived. The local Indian Agent then put his arm in with a stiffly-worded wire to the Comptroller. Comptroller Gibben relented and simply wired complete authority for a decision to Agent Higgins. Thus that hunt was allowed to proceed, and the intent of the Fish and Game Association was nullified.

The Shade brothers' operation was effectively stopped before the new ordinance was passed. The Association wrote to the Comptroller with its recommendations in February.⁴² Acting Comptroller Gibben replied that having discussed the proposed changes with a member of Council, he proposed to advertise the changes well in advance of their presentation to Council. Thus the Shade brothers were notified that they could not meet the residence requirements for outfitters, and were shut out. The new Ordinance was assented to July 17, 1947.

James H. Bond, Propagandist

James H. Bond is best known as the author of a book on big game hunting in the Yukon called From Out of the Yukon (Binfords and Mort, Portland, 1948). This book described Bond's hunt in 1947 in the then-unknown area of the Yukon northeast of Mayo. It was the first book on Yukon hunting to come along in many years and enjoyed a modest, though local success. Bond's activities connected with his hunt and the book led in an unusual, indirect way to the writing of Yukon Trophy Trails by Dolores Cline Brown (Grays, Sidney, 1971) the most recent book on Yukon big game hunting and written in much the same vein.

From Out of the Yukon is a quite engrossing account of a successful hunt in an area that had been visited by few men for many years. It is reminiscent of G.O. Young's book on hunting in the White River area in 1919. The author's undoubted gift at descriptive narrative gave the book its wide appeal, and helped to create an impression about the Yukon's big game resources to outsiders that was to persist and make big game outfitting a big business indeed.

There is more to the story than Bond recounts in his book. Territorial Government file No. 36275 in the Yukon Archives consists of Bond's correspondence with the Comptroller of the Yukon during the late Forties. The letters and the enclosures force the reader to take a different view of the man and to speculate on the consequences of Bond's skill as a publicist. Bond's attitudes towards game management - alien attitudes - may have influenced those of one newly-arrived and important Yukon resident: Them Kjar, the Director of Game and Publicity.

Bond first arrived in the Yukon in June 1947, having previously arranged his hunt with Louis Brown of Mayo. Brown was a trapper who first went into the Wind River area in 1939. In Bond's book (p.88) he said that Brown's first trapping season yielded him 65 wolf, 26 mink, 31 fox. This particular harvest was later widely discussed in Mayo in April of 1940.⁴³ That Brown and Bond had similar attitudes towards wolves is proved by Bond's letter to the Comptroller of June 30, 1947, shortly after his arrival. He urged the Territory to hire wolf hunters and permit them to use poison. He also wrote:

"I have known it to be a fact that a number of Indians in the fall of the year, coming upon game, will kill every one....I am well advised that the Indians will not catch fish for drying in the summer or fall months thus facing the winter without food...."

44

These are remarkable statements when one realizes Bond had been in the Yukon for merely two weeks and never left Whitehorse.

Bond's book is widely available and need not be discussed in detail. The book's relative success shows that his perception of the value of game was not uncommon. He singled out Indians and wolves as causing the decline in game population that was widespread in those years, with lesser effects from trappers and prospectors. He saw grizzly bears as a useless nuisance: "I was delighted at the thought of killing two maybe three grizzlies in one day" (p.99). He also wrote:

"The R.C.M.P. is a law enforcement body but as far as the game of the Territory is concerned, it has made little effort to save it. You might say it has made little or no effort to save it, because authority to do so has not been delegated to it." (p.73)

This statement is seriously misleading: by 1947 the R.C.M.P. had done yeoman service for the Territory and its game for half a century. One other aspect of Bond's book is pointed out by an undated, unsigned note in the Game files. It said that Bond took 3 caribou, and that his outfitter and guide each took 1 moose while actually guiding. These were illegal acts under the 1947 Game Ordinance, proclaimed before Bond went hunting.⁴⁵

Bond made 16 mm movies of his hunt. These movies and his newly-written book took him on a publicity tour of the United States and Canada in the following two years. He appeared at sporting goods sections of major department stores with his trophies and quantities of his book ready for signing. He lectured at meetings of the larger and likely better-heeled Fish and Game associations in major cities. Bond faithfully mailed volumes of newspaper clippings back to the Yukon Comptroller, Mr. Gibben. In letters sent with the clippings he repeatedly stressed the good publicity this would

bring to the Yukon. Mr. Gibben's replies were always courteous, but tangibly cool in tone.

In September 1949, the Yukon Territorial Government hired Mr. Them Kjar (pronounced tem care) of Alberta as its new Director of Game and Publicity. He quickly became aware of Bond's Yukon activities on his second hunt in that year. Kjar asked the Comptroller for regulations on the use of aircraft by big game hunters because Bond apparently used aircraft in his hunt in the upper MacMillan River District. He said that Bond could not possibly have used or taken out the meat.⁴⁷

Something must have happened during the next year to encourage Kjar to change his impression of Mr. Bond. In the fall of 1950, Portland, Oregon, declared "James Bond Week". Mr. Kjar received an invitation to attend and be a keynote speaker at a testimonial dinner. He accepted. Later clippings show that his talks were well received. But for the game animals of the Yukon it marked the passage of the old game management attitude of the animals being a resource of the "commons". The Yukon's big game became enclosed in one huge preserve that was responsive to foreign dollars rather than local needs.

Summary: 1896 to 1950

Previous sections of this report have shown that for fifty years in the Yukon the game was regarded mainly as a source of meat. Certainly it has always been so to the Indians, who took large numbers of animals every year. Trophy hunting was always incidental, a means of livelihood perhaps for at best a few dozen people. Market hunting was also a minor factor because it was so easy for the average Yukoner in the Twenties and Thirties to lay in a store of meat. The Alaska Highway appears

to be the underlying cause for making the game animals more valuable in a dollar sense to outsiders than to locals. It seems clear that the flood of people into the Territory during the Gold Rush had a crippling effect on game and their habitat. The R.C.M.P. was unable to prevent widespread slaughter. Not until 1904 do their reports show signs of a comeback in animal populations. But in the years from the decline of the Rush until the building of the Alaska Highway, the game population seems to have held its own, in equilibrium with a stable population.

The direct affect of the Alaska Highway on game is not clear. Certainly the habitat was permanently altered, but the Territorial Council did create "no hunting" areas and the Kluane Game Sanctuary. The number of convictions of highway personnel for game law infractions is not large. Tales of widespread slaughter may be exaggerations where one illegally-taken moose became ten; but the stories differ and more research and interviews are needed to substantiate them. The R.C.M.P. reports show, however, that most of their convictions were based on informant's reports; there were few patrols. The construction of the highway did something else to the Territory. It received a great deal of publicity in the media and by word-of-mouth from the thousands of people who passed through during the War.

The Yukon became a desirable place to go after big game trophies. The people of the Territory responded quickly to this new interest. The business of big game guiding or outfitting received new legislation. The Yukon Fish and Game Association became the voice for these interests. The new highway spliced together Yukon communities, and their essentially locally-managed game resources passed to the control of the new

Director of Game and Publicity. Alien trophy hunters with the means of publicity at their disposal created a perception of the Yukon as a big game hunter's paradise that may be in conflict with other uses. The Yukon's wonderful variety of big game animals became an export commodity, with wages more important than meat.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. RNWMP Annual Report 1899 p. 73
2. RSC 1906 ch. 151
3. Ord. Y.T. 1902, ch. 72
4. RNWMP Annual Report 1904 p. 25
5. RNWMP Annual Report 1901
6. RNWMP Annual Report 1904 p.39
7. Estimating dressed weights at 450 lbs. each for cattle, 80 lbs. for sheep and 50 lbs. for hogs; total weight of dressed meat is about 1,137,200 lbs./yr.
- 8, Canada Year Book 1974, p.457
9. The Dawson per capita meat consumption might approach 200 lbs. per year, since the population would have been largely adult, as opposed to the Canada-wide figure.
10. Estimating moose at 500 lbs. per carcass; caribou at 130 lbs. per carcass.
11. Territorial Treasurer's Report to Commissioner (Public Accounts) for 1921.
12. British Yukon Navigation Company Ltd., Superintendent's Annual Report of Operation for 1921.
13. Ord. Y.T. 1947 ch. 3 S.37
14. Ord. Y.T. 1953 (1st. Sess.) ch. 10 S.8
15. Ord. Y.T. 1908.
16. Armstrong, N.A.D.; After Big Game in the Upper Yukon; London, John Long, 1937.
Auer, H.A.; Campfires in the Yukon; Cinn.Stewart Kidd, 1916
Maguire, J.A.; In the Alaska-Yukon Gamelands; Cinn. Stewart Kidd, 1921.
Martindale, T.; Hunting in the Upper Yukon; Phila. G.W. Jacobs, 1913
Young, G.O.; Alaska-Yukon Trophies Won and Lost (2nd.Ed.), Huntington, Standard, 1947.
17. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-8, Apr.1929.

18. ibid; Files 12-8 to 12-20, various dates
19. ibid, File 12-4, July 1923
20. ibid, File 12-6, August 10, 1927
21. ibid, File 12-12, May 20, 1933
22. Cruikshank, Julie and Robb, Jim: Their Own Yukon. Yukon Native Brotherhood Whitehorse, 1975, p.64.
23. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3, File 12-19, Nov. 21, 1941
24. ibid, File 12-11, April 5, 1932
25. ibid, File 12-19, February 6, 1940
26. ibid, File 12-19, October 10, 1940
27. ibid, File 12-19, March 31, 1941
28. ibid, File 12-20, September 24, 1942
29. Ord. Y.T. 1942, ch.7
30. Ord. Y.T. 1943, ch. 4
31. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3, File 12-20, February 25, 1943
32. ibid, File 12-20, January 8, 1943
33. Various, File 12-20, Nov. 1942-August 1943.
34. Letter from Agent Higgins in Yukon Archives, Temporary Series 3 File 12-21; December 7, 1946
35. Alaska Sportsman Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Jan.1947) p.18
36. R.O.Y.T. 1971, Ch. G-1, S.48.
37. See for example Yukon Archives, Temporary Series 3, File 12-19, February 20, 1940.
38. ibid File 12-19, June 30, 1947
39. Ord. Y.T. 1947, Ch. 3, S.2

40. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3, File 35561 1945-1950
(note that this is not a large file as it concerns only
the Society)
41. ibid File 12-22, June 17, 1976, FF.
42. ibid File 35561, March 7, 1947
43. ibid File 12-19, April 6, 1940
44. ibid File 12-22, June 30, 1940
45. See Ord. Y.T. 1947, Ch. 3, Sections 5 and 10.
46. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3, File 36275.
47. ibid File 12-23, November 21, 1949.

Chapter 4

TROPHIES OR MEAT

Part Two:1950 - 1976

This section traces the rise of big game guiding as a successful Yukon business, from 1950 to 1976. These 26 years have seen the number of non-resident hunters increase from 60 to over 400 per year. Most of the Yukon Territory has been allocated to 22 outfitting or guiding areas, where the registered outfitter has the exclusive right to guide non-resident hunters. In the long run, the exclusive guiding areas may have caused more problems than they solved in helping the Territorial Government manage its big game resources and optimize revenue from them. Certain policy questions are unanswered.

More Hunters, More Trophies

Former outfitter Johnny Johns has talked about the difference between hunting parties in the Thirties and those of recent years. The most important difference was the length of the non-resident hunt. Johns took hunters on thirty and even sixty-day hunts. He would provision his pack train with supplies for that length of time. The hunter had arranged his affairs to enable him to be out of communication for the whole period. Being invariably men of considerable means, they did not take out insurance against mishap. Their accommodation and food, and exposure to accident, injury and bad weather were the same as their guides. The hunter was not given any guarantee of success in killing the animal he desired. Hunters were not concerned with bagging merely a single sheep or a single moose, they wanted a trophy-sized sheep or moose. The outfitter might promise to show the hunter game, but never guaranteed to guide the hunter to a

trophy animal. Non-resident hunters of the Twenties and Thirties were wealthy American bankers, industrialists, publishers, oil men, English remittance men and landholders, European bankers and even a sprinkling of noble titles. This was the era of the Sportsman.

Non-resident hunters today are mostly from the United States, especially California and Texas. In 1975 about ten percent of the 358 non-resident hunters were European; German, Swiss, Austrian, Norwegian and Spanish. A small number came from Mexico. These hunters spend an average of two weeks with their outfitter, although some hunt for three weeks and a few only one week. A party of four or six hunters flies by chartered aircraft to the base camp, on a lake central to that outfitter's territory. Many outfitters have elaborate, even luxurious accommodation at their base camps, supplied with most modern conveniences. Hunting parties then head out by horse pack train to hunt in the outfitter's territory, sleeping overnight in 'spike' camps. Even this accommodation is not exactly roughing it; the hunter has his own tent and cot and has his meals prepared for him. He is, after all, receiving a unique service with sixty years of tradition behind it. In that time, only the hunters have changed. Today's non-resident hunter is spending his money to purchase one or more Yukon game trophies - not a two-month wilderness experience as hunting was in the Twenties or Thirties. Table 6 shows the changes in non-resident hunting since the first year of firm data, 1946. The number of non-residents hunting in the Yukon each year averaged 72 from 1946 to 1958. In 1959, the number of hunters topped 100, and by 1974 reached 463. The period from 1959 to 1975 shows a nine percent annual increase in the number of hunters. By extrapolation this rate of growth will bring six hundred non-resident hunters into the Yukon in 1980.

Obviously such an increase in hunters must produce an increase in the number of animals killed. A Dall sheep is the most prized Yukon trophy. To 1958, non-residents took between 30 and 80 sheep per year with an average yearly take of 50. This would calculate to slightly less than one sheep per hunter per year. From 1958 to 1975 there has been a calculated annual ten percent increase in sheep killed by non-residents, from 65 to 245. A similar calculation for moose shows an annual eleven percent increase. By extrapolation of the plotted rates of increase and by neglecting possible policy, law or fee changes, one can obtain an estimate of the 1980 non-resident kill: 310 sheep and 230 moose.

Since the Territorial Government licences non-resident hunters, Territorial revenues should have undergone an increase at a rate proportional to the number of animals taken. There is a complication, in that annual increases in revenue have not been smooth; trophy fees were imposed in 1971, and substantially increased in 1975. Taking non-resident revenues for 1975/1976 (Table 6) less 1958/1959 revenues over a period of 17 years gives a crude annual increase of 17 percent compounded. In reality most of the increase occurred in 1975, when the government increased trophy fees by four or five times. For example fees for a mountain sheep went from 25 dollars to 150 dollars and for a grizzly bear from 65 dollars to 250 dollars. However the non-residence licence fee of 100 dollars has not changed since 1908.

There is one aspect of government trophy revenue over which it has no control and that is hunter success. One can determine non-resident hunter success year by year by calculating the factor total non-resident kill divided by number of licences issued. For 1975, 386 licenced hunters took 586 animals: moose, caribou, sheep, goat and bears. Thus each licence took a calculated 1.5 animals. Factors for

other years are as follows: 1970 - 1.7; 1965 - 1.9; 1960 - 2.0; 1955 - 2.5; 1950 - 2.1. In the last twenty years there has been a decline in the number of animals taken per hunter. One can speculate on the causes being a reduced big game population, or even in a decline in hunters' marksmanship. Most likely it is because today's hunts are shorter in duration, and the hunter has a reduced chance of obtaining the trophy he wants.

Yukoners have always prided themselves on the quality of the Yukon wilderness experience as a saleable commodity. Present management policies towards non-resident hunting are likely to bring nearly 600 hunters to the Territory in 1980, and they will take an estimated 310 sheep and 230 moose. However it is certain that their hunts will not be as valuable a wilderness experience as it is today, and only the palest imitation of the hunts of fifty years ago. Either the demand for a wilderness hunt will decline or the socio-economic profile of the clientele will change. Hunters in the early days were wealthy men. Today's hunter is more dollar-conscious and takes advantage of low prices for a top quality hunt. Tomorrow's hunter may have even fewer dollars to spend and an even greater desire to have a trophy - any kind of trophy - to show for his efforts and years of savings. If non-resident hunting and the outfitting business are to continue, then the Territorial Government must consider who these non-resident hunters shall be and how many dollars each they will be encouraged to spend. However if the price of a hunt is raised substantially, then the Territorial Government effectively undertakes to provide these hunters with a rewarding hunt. The number of big game animals is finite. Competition for these animals between residents and non-residents cannot continue indefinitely. The government must either reserve some animals for non-residents or end non-resident hunting

privileges. The only alternative is to enclose parts of the Territory as non-resident shooting preserves and to deny residents any access to them.

Since 1964 a Yukon business has offered a wilderness experience to non-residents that does not include the taking of game. It is the only business in which wildlife plays a major role, that makes a non-consumptive use of that wildlife. John Lammers says that he earns "a very modest living", and that if it was a fully commercial operation, he could handle larger numbers of people at a greatly reduced cost per person. He feels that this type of business could be expanded and that the Yukon's potential for it has not been realized. However unlike the outfitters, he must purchase a Yukon business licence; yet his business has no legal status and no protection from alien competitors. It is worth considering ways in which the Yukon can derive maximum benefit from showing the beauty of its wilderness area to any class of non-residents, hunters or otherwise.

Resident Hunting

Statistics on Yukon resident hunters are compiled annually by the Game Branch from returned hunter questionnaires. Game Harvest Report by Grant M. Lortie (mimeo, 1976) shows that 3714 resident licence holders are estimated to have taken 879 moose, 240 caribou, 8 goat, 53 sheep, 10 grizzly bear and 35 black bear in the 1975 season. Nearly 90 percent of these hunters went out for moose while only 26 percent were successful. For caribou, 43 percent hunted while only 15 percent were successful. Four percent did not hunt at all. Table 4 shows total big game taken by fiscal year. Resident hunters including Indians and trappers took 90 percent of the moose harvest, 89 percent of the caribou, 27 percent of the sheep

and 40 percent of the grizzly bears. The Yukon's population in 1976 is an estimated 21,631 (Table 1). Resident licences and general hunting licences for 1975/1976 total 4147. Thus twenty percent of all Yukoners take out licences, in addition to status Indians who are not required to buy a licence.

In 1956 the Yukon population was 12,190. In 1956/1957, 1792 residents took out licences, and killed 335 moose, 1624 caribou and 52 sheep.¹ These figures appear from Table 4 data minus the non-resident kill in Table 6. Moose taken divided by licences issued gives a crude success ratio of 18 percent, while licences issued over population gives 15 percent of the population taking out licences in 1956. These figures are given for comparison purposes but their accuracy is questionable. Probably even fewer Indians took out licences twenty years ago than now, and secondly the Indian game harvest would be unknown.

Comparison with British Columbia is useful since that province has similar game species and hunter access. The British Columbia Fish and Wildlife Branch has published a booklet The Value of Resident Hunting in British Columbia.² Like the Yukon Game Branch, British Columbia used a mailed questionnaire to licence holders to obtain their data. In 1970, 153,424 residents purchased licences, or seven percent of the population. Of these, 12 percent did not hunt and only 60 percent hunted big game, including deer. B.C. hunters took 68,100 deer and 19,900 moose. Thus 40 percent of B.C. hunters took one or more deer and 13 percent took a moose. The latter figure can be misleading; hunters in the Peace River area are very successful, 57 percent of them obtained a moose in 1970. Compared to British Columbia, more Yukoners go hunting and on the average are more successful in getting a moose.

The preceding chapter explained the importance of wildlife to Yukon residents up to 1950. Statistical analyses such as Lortie's show that for recent years, hunting continues to be important to Yukon residents both for recreation and as a source of meat. Yukoners like to hunt, and by and large are successful at it. Resident hunting has not necessarily come into conflict with non-resident hunting because residents generally hunt along the many roads, rivers and lakes in the Yukon; non-residents do not. However if non-resident hunting continues to grow at the rate it has since 1958, then the two types of hunter must inevitably compete with each other. Frequently such conflicts of land 'use' are settled by economic analyses: which use will yield the greater return to the landlord or in this case, the Territorial Government. Such analyses may place a dollar value on a moose. This poses the risk that the value will increase as the numbers decline. Giving Yukon moose some total value will not preserve the moose population. Soon only the wealthy would be able to afford to buy one.

An alternative analysis is to consider the value of land containing trophy game animals as compared to the value of other, apparently competitive uses for that land such as resident hunting or trapping. This leads to the continuing problem of the outfitting areas.

The Outfitting Business

The Yukon Territory south of latitude 66° has been delimited into 22 "Registered Guiding Areas". Within those areas only the licenced outfitter, registered to that area, may guide non-resident hunters. The outfitter is thereby granted a monopoly within a given area. By registering this area to a particular outfitter for a five-year term, the government

merely formalizes the "gentlemen's agreement" between outfitters made in 1958. The process that led to that agreement will be discussed later. The government does not grant tenure, no real property is bestowed. The government may abolish the outfitting areas at pleasure without expropriation and compensation.

The previous chapter showed how the 'outfitter' became written into the Game Ordinance in 1947. By 1950 the outfitters had formed themselves into a loose association to lobby for changes in the game ordinance. Apparently they were pressing for assigned territories, by a process of registration similar to trapline registration. Game Director Them Kjar wrote in April 1951,

"I have on several occasions pointed out to the Outfitters that the whole of the Yukon Territory (except Sanctuaries) is open for any licenced Chief Guide and his hunting parties to hunt over, and no stipulated area can be provided for anyone - except by a Gentleman's agreement amongst themselves. Last year this kind of agreement worked out pretty well and is the only way this problem can be solved." 3

Amendments to the Game Ordinance in 1952 introduced the concept of guiding 'territory', and changed the licence system to classes A, B and C. The Commissioner obtained powers to assign territory to guides, which was to be done at the time the licence was issued. Class A guides had to possess equipment sufficient to 'outfit' a hunting party of unstated size. Class B guides needed no extensive equipment because their assigned territory did not require it. Thus Class A guides might hunt with their parties in the traditional way with pack trains and spike camps. Class B guides could hunt from rivers and roads and did not need horses. Class C guides were assistant guides and needed no territory. The Commissioner reserved power to limit the number of licences.⁴

This method of managing the big game business deserves some analysis. In 1951, the number of non-resident hunters increased to 93 from 60 the year before. The new legislation must have been a reaction to this increase and to the threat of competition between outfitters over unorganized hunting territory. The Commissioner could act on the advice of the Game Branch and assign specific areas to specific guides. This would be a powerful management tool because hunting pressure could be controlled or virtually eliminated in any part of the Territory. Guides could equip themselves according to their bookings and obtain a hunting territory for the purposes of that booking, for that year. The guiding business would not be tied to a specific area every year. Those who were engaged in it could do so at their discretion, without being concerned with competition from other outfitters or guides. It was a novel approach to what has become a serious problem, but it did not last.

In October 1954, the Outfitters Association began to lobby for changes. The outfitters wanted a return to the old, 1947 system. In part they sought to eliminate the broad discretionary powers held by the Game Branch and The Commissioner. They wanted the non-resident licence fee dropped back to 100 dollars from 150 dollars. They took great exception to the close association between Direction Them Kjar and the well-known hunter James Bond.⁵ Kjar then wrote to Commissioner W.G. Brown that former Commissioner Fred Fraser initiated the changes in 1952 because he was determined to do away with the 'outfitter' idea and follow the system then in use in British Columbia. Kjar attached a letter from Bond criticizing what he called the selfish attitude of the outfitters.

"The outfitters of the Yukon Territory have never awakened to the fact that they have a potentially wonderful business.....There is nothing wrong in the Yukon except those outfitters think the game

*is free, and all they have to do is sell it
to the Americans at a big profit."*

6

The 1952 guide system survived until 1958. The new Game Ordinance reverted to the 1947 outfitter and guide classification and licence fees which survive in today's law. The outfitters obtained what they wanted partly because Them Kjar had resigned, being replaced by Geoff Bidlake as Acting Director. While Kjar had initiated the trapline registration system, he opposed the concept of guiding areas. Johnny Johns says that the outfitters, himself included, drew boundaries of the areas they wanted on a map and the Director then issued certificates of registration for that area, good for five years. Johns says that while his area was the smallest, the others were so large that the whole area could not be hunted in one year. Johns had been forty years in the business by that time, he knew exactly how much territory he would need to maintain his professional service and reputation. The others, having larger areas, had room to expand their annual bookings, and proceeded to do so. The steady nine percent growth in issuance of non-resident licences dates from 1958.

Management Aspects of the Guiding Industry

The problem of tenure over outfitting territories is unresolved and in some ways, is the most pressing problem before the Game Branch and the Yukon Territory concerning the management of wildlife economics. Game Branch officers are aware that some outfitting areas have a value in excess of \$100,000 dollars and that one particular area changed hands a few years ago for 150,000 dollars. Certainly that transaction included real property in the form of horses, buildings and equipment, but their total value would not equal the sale price.

The difference in value represents the worth of the outfitter area. It is an investment that could pay handsome dividends, but because it is not real property, it cannot be taxed. The Territorial Government cannot collect the economic rent arising from the 'ownership' of an outfitting area. To do so, it would have to grant some kind of legal tenure. But the Game Branch must manage all the game resources of the Yukon in its budget, including the animals within outfitting areas. Obviously then, present outfitter policies subsidize a particular livelihood or economic activity at the expense of other activities or uses of big game animals. If the Territorial Government was to bestow a legal tenure to an outfitting area then it must undertake to protect that tenure or property by limiting competition for its game resources. In other words, the government would then create a shooting preserve exclusively for non-residents. Secondly its actions would bestow a substantial capital gain on present holders of outfitting territories.

There are other aspects of the outfitting business that affect wildlife management. Twenty-two outfitters own on the average, between 25 and 30 horses, or about 600 horses in total. In winter, horses browse on low bushes and thereby compete for food with moose. Many outfitters import hay and grains to feed their stock in the coldest months. They recover their feed costs from the following season's hunt. Therefore in a sense, Yukon moose must help subsidize every horse owned by big game outfitters. The problem is made more acute by the Game Branch's responsibility to enforce the Brands Ordinance as it applies to horses.

Wolves have been a continuing preoccupation of the Game Branch, as is discussed in another chapter. In recent years the Branch has not attempted predator control programs where wolves

compete with men over wildlife. Predator control programs began in earnest in 1950 when an outfitter was given permission to poison wolves that may have been taking his horses.⁷

There is the problem of game meat and its alleged abandonment by non-resident hunters. Alfred Berger, M.L.A. (N.D.P.-Klondike) asked a question in the legislature in March 1975 concerning the salvage of game meat by outfitters and non-resident hunters. Mr. Peter Gillespie, Executive-Committee Member responsible for the Game Branch, replied that 5,762 lbs. of moose, 1,010 lbs. of caribou and 1,010 lbs. of sheep were taken from the Yukon by non-residents following the 1974 season hunt. That hunt took 192 moose, 176 caribou and 241 sheep. Using average dressed weights of 600 pounds per moose, 130 pounds per caribou and 80 pounds per sheep, the meat totalled 115,200 pounds moose, 22,880 pounds caribou and 19,280 pounds of sheep. Thus in 1974, non-residents took home about 5 percent of their moose meat and about 20 percent of their caribou and sheep meat. Of course the balance may not have been wasted, the hunters would eat game meat in their camps, and much of it would have been salvaged by the outfitters and their employees. It reduces to the question of cost of transporting the meat back to settlements where it can be used; consequently sheep and caribou meat is more apt to be salvaged than moose. Section 14 of the Game Ordinance prohibits wasting game meat. Chief Conservation Officer Mark Hoffman says that to his knowledge, no outfitter or non-resident has been charged under this section. Conviction might require the discovery of an abandoned carcass in the field.

The theme of these two chapters has been trophies or meat. Non-resident hunting, market hunting, unrestricted consumption

by Indians and generous resident bag limits did not diminish big game populations in the long period from 1911 to 1941. The Second World War and the Alaska Highway changed all this. Big game hunting became the leading economic activity concerning Yukon wildlife, especially since 1958. It seems that management policies have postponed making the choice between trophies and meat for many years. Either the government makes such a choice, or the Territory must be divided into game preserves.

The basic policy questions have been summarized by Bowden and Pearse in Non-Resident Big Game Hunting, their 1968 study of the British Columbia industry.⁸

Is non-resident hunting to be encouraged without limit?

If numbers are to be controlled, what method of rationing is to be adopted?

Is the objective of policy toward the guiding industry to maximize employment or economic prosperity (for these involve quite different action)?

To what extent, and how, is the public to share in the gains from commercial exploitation of game resources?

Where do priorities lie in cases of conflict between commercial hunting and unrestricted resident hunting?

How and to what extent, are the objectives of wildlife management to be allowed to affect the management of the industry?

All Yukoners who are awaiting the answers to these questions might do well to start looking for some answers. It would be a major step towards achieving a management policy for all the Yukon's resources.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Annual Report of the Director; March 1957; File 3900-3.
2. Study Report No. 6, Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1972.
3. Central Records Box 5015; Yukon Outfitters Ass'n; Apr.1951.
4. Ord. Y.T. 1952 (1st. Sess), Ch.13.
5. Central Records Box 5015; Yukon Outfitters Ass'n; Oct. 1954.
6. ibid; Nov, 1954.
7. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3 File 12-23; Nov. 1950.
8. Bowden, G. and Pease, P; Non-resident Big Game Hunting and the Guiding Industry in British Columbia; B.C. Fish and Wildlife Branch; Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1968.

Chapter 5

MANAGEMENT OF HABITAT

The Yukon Act amendment of 1900 granted the Yukon Territory powers to make ordinances for the preservation of game. Consequently Territorial Council passed the first Game Ordinance in January, 1901. But this ordinance and all those that followed it were intended for conditions that may not necessarily exist today.

In the early years of the Territory there was no competition for use of Crown land. For thirty years the Yukon's population held steady at about 4000. Mining activity consisted of dredging in the Klondike and small-scale quartz mining near Keno and Whitehorse. The Territorial Government constructed roads and other public works to lower mining costs and encourage mining. The mining activity impinged on such small areas that the wildlife needed no special protection. As the Yukon developed, new mines, roads and other activities caused the government to move to protect its wildlife resources. But the only avenue open to the Territorial Government to protect wildlife habitat was and still is through the creation of areas where special regulations preventing hunting pressure and harassment of wildlife can apply.

The Federal Government has jurisdiction over the Yukon's lands, forests and waters. Consequently any Ottawa decision concerning resources other than game may conflict with the Yukon's own powers and responsibilities. This conflict is real enough: in 1946 Ottawa disallowed a game ordinance amendment which exercised the Yukon's right to apply special game laws to special areas.¹ In future years the Yukon Territorial Government could seek to make its existing powers for the preservation of game much more site-specific and take the risk of disallowance by the Governor General in Council. Thus while the Territory has no powers over the

alienation of resources, it can explore and enact certain site-specific powers over wildlife and thereby indirectly exert a measure of control over other resources.

This section deals with the history of the Yukon's attempts at game habitat control through the creation of preserves, sanctuaries and game management zones since 1901, with a discussion of other attempts at control which were not realized. It should be mentioned here that early Territorial Councils passed ordinances respecting streams and forests which were repealed in the Fifties. They were superceded by regulations under the Dominion Lands Act. However, their repeal did not mean loss of control, for none ever existed. The early ordinances merely protected the prior use of water and forest resources from the actions or negligence of others.

Game preserves allocate the use and consumption of game to a certain specific group of people. Preserves are a very old management concept. In the United Kingdom and Europe game was always the property of the land holder or the nobility. France was the first European country to grant "democratic" or universal access to game as a result of the French revolution in 1789.² In North America, early immigrant Europeans simply took game as they needed it. Depletion and even extinction of certain species led to game laws as we know them by the 1880's. Closed seasons, bag limits and restrictions on certain weapons and activities are management tools dating from this period. Where these methods of restricted entry, or universal entry-restricted use are felt to be insufficient to preserve game, the last resort before the end point of a cage in a zoo is to create a game sanctuary where no animal may be killed or taken by anyone.

Traditional Indian rights to game appear to conflict with what are essentially non-Indian game laws. In the Yukon .

as in other parts of Canada this conflict has not yet been resolved. Game Branch records extending 70 years show that Yukon Indians and even Mackenzie River Indians exercised their rights to take animals for food without hindrance. Certain parts of the Game Ordinance through those years applied to Indians, but the provisions for seasons, bag limits and licences have not. Indians have accepted those parts of the Ordinance regulating and licencing economic activities such as trapping, guiding and market hunting. In fact Indians are still the mainstay of Yukon wildlife use economics. The Territorial Government recognized the importance of game to the Indians' well-being and livelihood when it created the Yukon's two preserves.

Peel River Game Preserve

Imperial Oil Ltd. discovered oil at Norman Wells, N.W.T. in 1920. Partly as a result of this discovery and to remove any ambiguity about ownership of the land, Ottawa negotiated Treaty 11 with Mackenzie River Dene peoples in 1921. The treaty created a large preserve where only Indian peoples could hunt and trap in the Mackenzie District between the Peel and the Mackenzie Rivers. However, this included only part of the area traditionally used by Mackenzie River Dene.

In 1924 the Minister of the Interior petitioned the Yukon Territorial Council to create a preserve to match that in the Northwest Territories. Accordingly Council passed An Ordinance to Create a Game Preserve in the Yukon Territory for Native Indians (Ord. Y.T. 1924, Ch.1). The Ordinance prevented all but "bona fide aboriginal natives of the Yukon Territory" from taking game and furs in the preserve. The portion set aside as a preserve included that area east of

the Peel and Snake Rivers and west of the Yukon-N.W.T. border comprising some 2200 square miles. A 1938 amendment permitted prospectors to take animals for food on the Yukon side of the preserve.³ The 1958 Game Ordinance consolidated the 1924 preserve ordinance into a separate section and stripped prospectors of the right to take game in the preserve. The Peel River Preserve is still in law, in Section 82 and schedule 1 of the Game Ordinance (R.O.Y.T. 1971 Ch. G-1 as amended to 1977).

Fishing Branch Preserve

The Canadian Department of Environment, Fisheries and Marine Services investigated Yukon fisheries in the Old Crow - Porcupine River area in connection with gas pipeline proposals beginning in 1971. Their work showed that a section of the Fishing Branch River held very large numbers of spawning chum salmon. The salmon in turn supported high populations of grizzly bears. This small area has great importance in relation to its size in the southern Porcupine drainage.

Territorial Council approved the creation of the Fishing Branch Preserve in February 1972 (Ord. Y.T. 1972 Ch.19). The preserve is a rectangular area containing 1554 square miles. It is a preserve for the use of Indians only, like the Peel River Preserve. This allows Old Crow Indians to continue to take fur from within its borders. The main purpose of the Game Branch in seeking its establishment was to protect the salmon spawning channels from disruption by mineral exploration or pipeline construction.⁴ As mentioned above, the Yukon Territory has no control over the alienation of mineral resources. The Branch felt that creation of a preserve would "lend weight" to other agencies attempting to regulate the manner of resource exploitation and to protect the salmon spawning beds and the grizzly bears.

Kluane Game Sanctuary and National Park

It has been mentioned how traditional Indian rights to game have tended to conflict with game law. The divergence of the two attitudes towards game is most acute in applying game sanctuary law. The legal question of Indian hunting in the Kluane Sanctuary has led to misunderstanding and some bitterness on both sides and has yet to be resolved.

The Alaska Military Highway was completed in November of 1942. The ceremony marking the opening of the road was held on the highway itself, on a bluff overlooking Slims River and Kluane Lake. For most Ottawa dignitaries it was their first look at the spectacular Kluane area. Perhaps they heard stories about highway construction personnel killing too much game. Whatever the reason, on December 8, 1942, the Canadian Cabinet withdrew the Kluane area from alienation by others to preserve it for parks purposes.⁵

The original cabinet order withdrew the whole of Kluane Lake, all areas south of the Alaska Highway and the White River, and all areas west of the Dezadeash and Alsek Rivers. This order closed the land to location and use by anyone including prospectors and homesteaders. In September 1944, at the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, Cabinet amended the 1942 order by setting new boundaries.⁶ The new boundaries extended the reserve farther east to the Haines Road but reduced it on the north side to 10 miles from the Alaska Highway and five miles from the White River. A third order in November 1944 opened the reserve to prospecting and staking of claims, but subject to terms and provisions of the National Parks Act.⁷ The Department of Mines and Resources decided quite early that the area would become a national park; consequently Commissioner G.A. Jeckell would have been asked to propose a matching game sanctuary

to the Territorial Council.

In April 1943 Territorial Council approved an amendment to the Game Ordinance creating the Kluane Sanctuary.⁸ It is not known if the planned national park was discussed in the Yukon at the time, or if the feeling that the Kluane area game animals needed protection was widespread. In the period from September 1942 to March 1943 the Commissioner received many queries from Ottawa about game conditions along the Alaska Highway. He always replied in a manner that suggests Yukoners were not alarmed about the Highway's impact on wildlife.⁹ For example in the spring of 1942, Council granted resident hunter privileges to U.S. Army and other personnel who were building the highway, and did not revoke those privileges for several years.¹⁰ The desire for a game sanctuary appears to have been felt more strongly in Ottawa than in Dawson City. Residents of the Kluane area played no role in the original decision.

The new sanctuary had boundaries identical to the 1942 Order in Council. When the land reserve was altered in 1944, Council followed suit with the sanctuary in 1945.¹¹ This left a strip 10 miles wide and 100 miles long lying to the west and south of the Alaska Highway where hunting was permitted. The strip extended from Congdon Creek (old M.P.1071) to the White River bridge (M.P. 1170). The protection for Sheep Mountain and the Slims River area continued.

In April 1946 Council changed the boundaries of the sanctuary again so as to include the 10 mile strip south of the Alaska Highway. The Kluane Game Sanctuary now extended from the International Border down the White River and the Alaska Highway to the Haines Road and the British Columbia border.

This ordinance was disallowed by order of the Governor General in Council in August 1946.¹² The preamble to the Order said that Indians were in doubt as to whether or not they had the right to hunt in the sanctuary and that the wording of the ordinance did not make it clear. The sanctuary remained without the 10 mile strip for several years. A new Game Ordinance in 1947 rewrote the section on sanctuaries but did not alter the boundaries at first. The ordinance contained a section which allowed the sanctuary to expand over 10 mile strip automatically in October of 1949. The present boundaries of the sanctuary have not changed since that date.

The question of Indian rights to hunting in the Kluane Game Sanctuary and National Park has been a contentious issue since 1946. Ottawa cancelled the expanded sanctuary boundaries because it had received complaints from Indians. After the cancellation Northern Affairs Director R.A. Gibson at Ottawa was advised by F.H.R. Jackson, Yukon Forest Engineer, that the 10 mile strip had no game. He said it merely served as a screen enabling people to hunt undetected in the sanctuary proper. Jackson wrote that no one had complained about the Kluane Sanctuary when it was first created in 1943. Gibson wrote to the Commissioner in January 1947, "From information we have received since, we are somewhat doubtful whether it was necessary to refuse consent to the Territorial Ordinance."¹³

The full-sized sanctuary appeared in October of 1949. This coincided with one other event, the appointment of Them Kjar as the first Director of Game. Within a year the Indian hunting issue came up again. Kjar had been a Game Officer in Alberta. He brought with him into the Yukon

certain styles of game management and law enforcement that would have been alien to Indians in the Kluane-Burwash area. Ottawa was soon receiving complaints from the Burwash Indian community voiced through Fr. Morrisset and Bishop Coudert, that the sanctuary had imposed hardship. Commissioner A.H. Gibson in his reply attempted to qualify the priests' allegations and said there was no hardship. To the Deputy Minister's request that the sanctuary be opened to Indians for one year, the Commissioner granted two special permits to Indians to take a limited number of animals in the sanctuary.¹⁴

This three-way conflict between the Indians, Ottawa and the Territorial Government subsided on agreement that the game resources of the sanctuary would be surveyed by the Canadian Wildlife Service. Accordingly Dr. Banfield, Chief Mammologist of the Wildlife Service, went into the sanctuary on a 12-day trip in June 1951 and reported to the Commissioner in January 1952. Evidently Banfield saw more game outside the Kluane Game Sanctuary than he saw inside.¹⁵ The result was that the Game Branch felt the sanctuary was necessary and continued to enforce it. But the Indian hunting question remains.

Yukon Indians had their traditional hunting rights set out in the Yukon Act in 1960. The Yukon Territorial Government's powers over game can not interfere with the Indian rights to hunt for food on unoccupied Crown land.¹⁶ The Territorial Government has taken the position that a game sanctuary is "occupied" Crown land, therefore Indians may not hunt in it.¹⁷ The issue turns on the word "occupied": no court decision could settle the matter, it requires negotiation.

The Kluane land reserve and most of the game sanctuary became a National Park in April 1976, over thirty years after the land was withdrawn. The reasons for Ottawa's reluctance to place the proposal before Parliament are not clear. Certainly Yukoners had many years to get used to the idea. A motion of the Territorial Council called for the creation of a park as early as 1962.¹⁸ The question of expropriation and compensation for surface and mineral rights may have been a factor. The final park boundaries excluded many areas of mineral discovery located after the Order in Council of 1944. Kluane became included in a section of the National Parks Act in 1974 under the conditions that its creation would not prejudice claims of the Yukon Indians over any part of the area.¹⁹ The section was proclaimed in April 1976.

McArthur Game Sanctuary

The Yukon Territory has a second game sanctuary in addition to Kluane. This is the McArthur Game Sanctuary in the central Yukon. It contains 684 square miles and is situated between the Macmillan and Stewart Rivers, east of the Klondike Highway. It was created in 1948 as an amendment to the Game Ordinance.²⁰

The McArthur Sanctuary owed its existence to Dr. Hugh Bostock of the Geological Survey of Canada. Dr. Bostock spent many years in the Yukon reporting on mining activity and carrying on the work of the Survey such as geological mapping. Bostock wrote to Commissioner J.E. Gibben in November 1947 proposing that the McArthur Range receive some protection.²¹ The Range had several distinct features. First it was isolated as an "island" during the last (Wisconsin) glaciation and its plant community was unique in the Yukon. Second it contained a small population of mountain sheep that seemed to be a unique subspecies between the dark coloured Stone sheep and the

near-white Dall sheep. Finally the range included a hot spring which was used by the sheep. Dr. Bostock had knowledge of other parts of the Yukon where isolated bands of sheep had been eliminated by hunting. He was concerned that when the then-planned Mayo Road was complete, the McArthur sheep would be threatened.

Bostock's observations of the McArthur Range and sanctuary have been supported by biologists Val Geist and Robert Ogilvie of the University of Calgary. These men investigated the site in 1970, in an evaluation under the International Biological Program. They recommended that the sanctuary be included in the reserves program because of its unique ecology and evidence of man's activities near the hot springs.²²

Mt. Haldane and Pine Lake Sanctuaries

The Yukon Territory had two other game sanctuaries until recently. The Mt. Haldane sanctuary was created by Commissioner's Order in 1956.²³ Residents in the Mayo-Keno area noticed sheep returning to the mountain after being absent for many years. The sanctuary was intended to protect only sheep; other animals could be taken in season. The Mt. Haldane Sanctuary was abolished in 1958 with the adoption of the new game ordinance. The Pine Lake Sanctuary was created by a Commissioner's Order in 1956.²⁴ Superintendent Hough of the Dominion Experimental Farm requested the small 9 square mile sanctuary to protect the immediate area of the farm from careless shooters. The sanctuary was abolished in a 1971 amendment to the Game Ordinance.

Game Branch efforts at habitat control have not always been successful. The Yukon has no bird refuges or protected

sites under the International Biological Program. The Arctic International Wildlife Range is still only a proposal. Because lands are a Federal matter and wildlife a Territorial matter, and proposal for withdrawal or protection of lands requires agreement between both levels of government. There is the added proviso that Yukon Indians have an interest in these matters to the extent that at their request, planning and alienation processes have been effectively suspended as of 1976, with the exception of mining and oil exploration.

International Biological Program

The International Biological Program is a United Nations' initiated proposal. In Canada it received assistance from the National Research Council and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. The program seeks the withdrawal of certain areas from development to protect their ecological significance. In Canada its senior personnel come from the Canadian Wildlife Service and universities. The Canadian section selected fourteen sites in the Yukon as deserving of preservation. Two of these areas, Wolf Lake and the McArthur Range, were examined in I.B.P. funded studies. The lack of involvement of the Territorial Government became a concern because this government's parks program had its own, possibly conflicting proposals and because the I.B.P. board seemed to be negotiating only with Ottawa in the matter of consultation in withdrawal of mineral and oil rights. The present position of the Game Branch is that it desires more consultation before any I.B.P.-initiated land withdrawals occur.²⁵

Tagish Waterfowl Refuge

The Tagish or Six Mile River is an important staging area for migrating waterfowl. The Yukon Game Branch desired extra protection for the birds. It held meetings with representatives of the Department of Environment and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and later in a public meeting at Tagish, with the residents of the area. There was general agreement that a bird refuge at Tagish was desirable. The Yukon Canadian Wildlife Service representative sent a formal application for a refuge to the Director of the Pacific Region of the Service early in 1976.²⁶ No action had been taken on the proposal at the end of the year, which Mr. Malcolm Dennington of the Wildlife Service attributed to uncertainty over Indian land claims.²⁷ Meanwhile the lands branch of the Department of Northern Affairs has withdrawn lands along the east bank of the river, to protect that side from further cottage development.

Arctic International Wildlife Range

The Arctic International Wildlife Range proposal was the reason for an international conference at Whitehorse in 1970, hosted by the Yukon Conservation Society. Delegates hoped that Canada would withdraw or otherwise protect a portion of the Yukon's north coast adjoining the Alaskan Arctic Wildlife Range. Delegates formed a society and began lobbying with Northern Affairs and other agencies to see the Range come into being. Their desire was to see the British Mountains and other areas north of Old Crow protected from unregulated oil and mineral exploration. Since the Whitehorse Conference was sponsored by many oil companies with northern holdings, the aims of the delegates were not necessarily in conflict with oil and gas interests. Ottawa reacted

favourably to the proposal at first, but did not issue the required Order in Council that would create the Range. In 1976, the pivotal role of the Yukon lands claims process and the Territorial Government's reluctance to surrender even its small measure of control over those lands had effectively shelved the proposal.²⁸

Game Management Zones

Game Management Zones describe how a jurisdiction with its own game law amends or alters the law for certain parts or zones within that jurisdiction. The zones keep within the "democratic" system of universal access; they merely regulate what the hunter can do in each zone. They are more a means of regulating hunting pressure zone by zone rather than being means to improve habitat.

The Yukon Legislature granted the Game Branch powers to set up Game Management Zones in May 1975 (Ord. Y.T. 1975, 2nd. Sess.). Subsequent regulations established 11 game management zones, with powers for the Commissioner to set seasons, daily hunting period, bag limits, methods and the species that may be taken in each zone. The new zonal regulations applied to all hunters, resident and non-resident alike. They have given the Game Branch much flexibility in protecting certain species from excessive hunting pressure. By way of comparison, British Columbia has had game management zones for many years. In 1975 the Province became divided into 218 management units making hunting regulations much more selective and intensive. Earlier in 1973 the Province began a limited entry system that restricted hunting in certain areas to residents only. Alaska's game laws have evolved along similar lines.

Proposed Nisutlin Bay Refuge

It has been known for many years that the head of Nisutlin Bay on the east shore of Teslin Lake is an important wintering area for moose. These moose normally live upstream along the Wolf and Nisutlin River valleys. In winter, they congregate in unusually large numbers in the willows at the head of Nisutlin Bay. This area has importance also as a waterfowl staging area, particularly for geese. The Game Branch was concerned in 1973 that horses on grazing leases adjacent to the Bay were competing with moose for forage. The Nisutlin Bay delta and others like it constitute critical wintering range for moose. Their small area conceals a much larger ecological importance. The Branch has not attempted to create a wildlife sanctuary but has asked that the adjacent lands be withdrawn by notation from development as cottage sites or grazing leases. The Game Branch may seek legislation to enable it to protect small critical areas such as Nisutlin Bay.²⁹

This section has described the means whereby the Yukon Territory has attempted to protect its wildlife resources in certain specific areas of the Yukon as an approach toward regulating wildlife habitat. The Peel River and Fishing Branch game preserves have hunting and trapping rights reserved for Indians only. Two sanctuaries, Kluane and McArthur, prohibit hunting and trapping within their borders, but the applicability of this law to Indians is still not established. Other efforts at habitat control including the International Biological Program, Wildfowl refuges and the Arctic International Wildlife Range have not met with success because they require three-way agreement between the Territorial Government, Yukon Indians and the Federal Government. Once this agreement is reached, one could hope that a comprehensive land use policy for the Territory will crystallize and create a fair balance between maintenance of wildlife habitat and other land uses.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-22; Sept.1946.
2. Manchester Guardian; Vol. 115 No.13; Sept. 26, 1976.
3. Ord. Y.T. 1938, Ch.9.
4. Game Branch File 3980-1; 5 Jan. 1972.
5. PC 11142; Dec. 8, 1942; in Game Branch File 3980-4.
6. PC 7101; Sept. 15, 1944 in ibid.
7. PC 9030; Nov. 30, 1944 in ibid.
8. Ord. Y.T. 1943; Ch.4.
9. Archives op. cit. File 12-20.
10. Ord. Y.T. 1942, Ch.1.
11. Ord. Y.T. 1945 Ch. 11.
12. PC 3518; Aug. 27, 1946 in Archives op. cit.
13. Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-22; Jan. 1947.
14. Game Branch File 3980-4, to February 1951.
15. ibid.
16. R.S.C. 1970 (1st. Suppl.), C.48, S.17(3).
17. Territorial Government Legal Advisor P. O'Donoghue, personal communication, Dec. 9, 1976.
18. Game Branch File 3980-4, January 1963.
19. 23 Eliz. II, c.11, s.11.
20. Ord. Y.T. 1948, C.18.
21. Game Branch File 3980-5; Nov.3,1947.
22. ibid; July 1971.
23. Game Branch File 3980-1 (Suppl.); Aug.1956.
24. ibid.
25. Game Branch File 3904-5.
26. Game Branch File 3980-1.
27. M. Dennington C.W.S., Dec.8,1976, personal communication.
28. Game Branch File 3904-3.
29. Game Branch File 3980-1.

Chapter 6

YUKON EXOTIC SPECIES

The Yukon's wildlife and game resources are well-known. They include valuable fur bearers, upland birds and big game animals such as moose and mountain goat, two species of caribou and sheep and three species of bear. Less well-known but often reported are mule deer, cougar, coyotes and elk in the southern part of the Territory. The Yukon may contain ring-necked pheasants, wood buffalo, Alaskan brown bear and muskoxen. But not all of this wonderful variety are long-time Yukon residents. Some animals have moved in from adjacent areas and appear to be staying. Others have been deliberately introduced and have made the Yukon their home.

Yukon Indians have long memories of the Yukon's animals. Dr. Catherine McClellan has gathered many of their stories into her book My Old People Say (National Museum of Canada; Publications in Ethnology No. 6; Ottawa, 1975). These stories probably have basis in fact; they are at least an indication of physical changes in animal populations through the years. McClellan writes that Indians remember when Aishihik, Kluane and Teslin Lakes used to be "black with caribou" in their winter migrations. Sometimes the people drove the caribou into special fences or corrals to catch them in slings or shoot them. Remains of these fences exist near Dezadeash, Haines Junction and Tagish though the caribou have not come so far south in 50 years. In fact, the hunting of moose in the eastern Yukon is a recent development. Moose moved in as the caribou population declined, so the people had to learn how to hunt moose instead.

McClellan reports old people as saying that deer and coyotes came into the Yukon about the time of the Gold Rush and cougar only since the building of the Alaska Highway. But the old people of Teslin have stories of one very rare animal indeed, bison or wood buffalo. McClellan writes of them saying that in their grandparents' time (circa 1850?) there were bison in the Liard River drainage and possibly as far northwest as the Pelly River. But if there are bison in the Yukon today, they are part of another group.

Bison or Wood Buffalo

In 1943 Dr. C.H.D. Clarke, then of the Dominion Lands, Parks and Forests Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, wrote a report on wildlife conditions in the Yukon Territory.¹ Of bison he said that one had been reported killed near Lower Post in 1939 by Father Beaubier, then of Fort Selkirk. Dr. Clarke concluded after his assessment of the Yukon's potential that bison should be introduced into the Aishihik area. Dr. Clarke's opinions were quoted by the Yukon Fish and Game Association in a letter to the Commissioner in September 1945.² They urged the importation of elk, bison and deer. They pointed to the success of the Alaskan buffalo herd near Big Delta, introduced in 1928 and grown by 1945 into a herd of 500 animals. In 1947 the Territorial Government voted \$7,000.00 for purchase of imported animals. Not until 1950 did plans materialize.

The Yukon's new Director of Game and Publicity, Mr. Them Kjar, began discussions with Alaskan authorities about buffalo in April 1950.³ Kjar and Dr. Dewey Soper of the Dominion Wildlife Service spent part of the summer of 1950 investigating the suitability of range in the Aishihik, Nordenskjold and Braeburn areas. Soper's report was favourable but other obstacles remained. Canadian

agriculture specialists required the imported animals to be certified as free of disease. Alaskan authorities requested certain crates and holding facilities. These arrangements took so much time that the winter season arrived and the Alaskans judged it to be too late in the year to attempt the transfer.

The bison had attracted a lot of attention in the Yukon. The Yukon Fish and Game Association voted \$1,200.00 to help obtain the animals and Indian Affairs granted a further \$400.00. A Yukon Council appropriation of \$1,500.00 was earmarked for both buffalo and elk, but the Commissioner authorized \$500.00 for the buffalo import. Part of the expenditure paid for a road and corral near Braeburn, the rest for transport and wages.

The plans of many agencies and individuals became successful in September 1951, when 5 animals, 2 males and 3 females, bolted from their corral at Braeburn. The Alaskans had captured 6 but a young heifer died of heart failure before crating. In the spring of 1952 it became clear that the younger bull had wandered off on its own. The Dominion Experimental Farm at Haines Junction complained that this animal was molesting the cattle enclosures. It stayed near Haines Junction for many years, being reported many times. Finally in July 1958 this lonely bull was shot in a case of alleged mistaken identity that did not convince the Court.

The small herd of 3 cows and 1 bull crossed the height of land from the Braeburn-Hutshi area where it was intended they would live, into the Nisling River valley. If the bison still exist today they are somewhere in the 1500 square miles of the Nisling Valley. Reports on the herd since 1951

have been sporadic and inconclusive. In July 1955 a group including calves was seen near the Aishihik turnoff on the Alaska Highway, yet in the same month some were spotted near the Nisling River. In 1957 a small herd was reported as far west as the junction of the Donjek and the White Rivers. Individual sightings of one or several animals in the Nisling area continued as late as January 1973.

Game Branch biologist Bill Klassen went looking for the Yukon's buffalo in October of 1976 in an Armed Forces Twin Otter on a training flight. He did not see the animals anywhere in the full length of the Nisling, but allowed that the aircraft was not the best for aerial reconnaissance and there was no snow cover to show tracks. If Yukon buffalo still exist they may be expensive to locate.

Elk or Wapiti

The Yukon Fish and Game Association urged the Territorial Government in 1946 to import elk as well as buffalo. They began a correspondence with Alberta game officials and with the Dominion Parks Service to obtain elk from Elk Island Park.^{4, 5, 6} Their negotiations with Alberta involved Game Officer Them Kjar, later the first Director of the Yukon Game Branch. The Parks officials requested that wildlife officials survey the intended range of the animals to see if it was suitable. These and other preparations delayed the plans for several years, until Dr. Soper surveyed the Aishihik, Nordenskjold and Braeburn areas for both buffalo and elk in 1950.⁷

Five years of negotiations and preparations ended with the release of 19 elk from Alberta at Braeburn in September, 1951. Fourteen cows and five bulls came up the Alaska

Highway in two trucks without mishap. They were held at the corral at Braeburn for a short time before being released. In April 1954, a further 30 head were taken from Elk Island Park and released near Braeburn. The second release included 22 cows and 8 bulls, for a total of 49 animals in the two releases.

The elk are often seen by Yukon residents on the Alaska Highway near Takhini. A second, larger group ranges near Hutshi. Game Branch estimates of the size of the herds are 22 animals in the Takhini-Kusawa area and 30 in the Hutshi herd. The Branch is concerned because the herd seems to be merely holding its own and not increasing.

Game Branch biologists carried out a tagging and measurement program on the Hutshi herd in October of 1976. Eight animals were shot by tranquillizer gun; weighed, examined and tagged. A Canadian Wildlife Service veterinarian examined the drugged animals and later tested blood samples for brucellosis, a disease of the reproductive organs. Branch biologists felt that the presence of the disease could be a factor in lowering the rate of natural recruitment. Fortunately the tests proved negative, but the problem of slow recruitment still remains.

The introduction of exotic animals into the Yukon has had only limited success in the case of bison and elk. Certainly they have survived, but they have not reproduced to the extent envisaged when they were introduced and the reasons for this are still unknown.

Ring-Necked Pheasants

In 1945 the Yukon Fish and Game Association released "two lots" of ring-necked pheasants near Champagne and later

reported that they survived the winter.⁸ Game Branch records since that time do not report any other plantations of pheasants, but the files contain many hearsay occurrences near Whitehorse over the past 30 years. Their continued presence in a natural state is doubtful.

Game Branch biologist Dave Mossop believes that it is unlikely pheasants would fare very well in the Yukon because they are not adapted to severe winter conditions. Their legs and feet lack the insulating layer of feathers that grouse and ptarmigan have. They do not roost in deep snow to preserve body heat. They are primarily seed eaters while grouse are capable of feeding on buds when other foods are snow-covered. Until a sighting is authenticated, Mossop believes their continued existence in the Yukon is doubtful. Experiments in Alaska with pheasants have met with failure. None remain of the hundreds introduced in all parts of Alaska in the Thirties and Forties.

Muskoxen

If the Yukon has any muskoxen, they are recent immigrants from Alaska. Alaska had muskoxen as late as 1860. State authorities re-established muskoxen with animals from Greenland in 1930. As this original herd grew, small groups of animals were transplanted elsewhere in the State. In this way Alaska Fish and Game personnel released 52 animals in April 1969 at Barter Island on the Arctic coast, 70 miles west of the Yukon border.¹⁰ Contrary to expectations, some of the muskoxen moved east rapidly. Eskimos unaware of the existence of these animals shot one at Shingle Point and two at Shoal Bay, which is nearly 200 miles from the point of release. The Canadian Government responded quickly declaring muskoxen an endangered species in October 1969 and advertised their presence widely.¹¹

Notes to Chapter 6

1. C.H.D. Clarke; Biological Reconnaissance of the Alaska Military Highway with Particular Reference to the Yukon Territory and the Proposed National Park therein; Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa. Unpublished ms. in Yukon Archives; Temporary Series 3; File 12-20, February 10, 1944.
2. Temporary Series 3; File 35561; September 11, 1945.
3. Game Branch current File No. 3997-11.
4. Game Branch current File No. 3997-5.
5. Central Records Game Branch Files Box 'E'; "Elk and Bison".
6. Archives Temporary Series 3; File 35561.
7. in Game Branch current File 3997-5.
8. Archives Temporary Series 3; File 35561.
9. Burns and McKnight; Game Transplants in Alaska; Alaska Dept. Fish and Game, Juneau, 1973, p. 43.
10. ibid p. 15
11. Game Branch current File 3997-4.

Chapter 7

THE GAME BRANCH 1949 to 1976

"The Yukon Council will never make an appropriation for a Game Warden, they are nearly all business men and it don't hurt them if all the game is killed."

wrote W.H. Lucas of Carcross to Commissioner Henderson in December 1910.¹ The subject never appeared again in the Commissioner's correspondence concerning game until 1944, when Comptroller Jeckell said that the Territory had no need of a wildlife technician.² Finally in 1949, Territorial Council did make an appropriation for a 'Game Warden' and the Department of Game and Publicity came into being. Most of the information in the following sections comes from current File 3900-3 Annual Report, 1951 - 1976.

The Game Branch in the Fifties

Them Kjar (pronounced 'tem care') formerly a Game Officer in Alberta, took up residence in Whitehorse in the summer of 1949 as the first Director of Game and Publicity. Elsewhere in this report in the discussion of the introduction of elk, the key role of the Yukon Fish and Game Association was described. They had corresponded with Kjar in Alberta. One of the Association's officers - either W.D. MacBride or Geoff Bidlake - may have known him and interested him in the Yukon. Kjar's first budget for 1949/1950 was \$22,000 as shown in Table 3.

Mr. Gordon I. Cameron joined the new Branch at the same time, as Assistant Director. Cameron's specific responsibility was the registration of traplines, a task for which he was well suited. Cameron had been an R.C.M.P. officer at many places in the Yukon for 25 years, and had extensive knowledge of the traditional trapping areas and their ownership.

Cameron says that he and Them Kjar set up shop in the back of the old Whitehorse Liquor Store, using planks over two barrels as a desk. They had no secretary and did their own typing. He said that their funds were so tight that even purchasing enough postage stamps to answer the many enquiries put a strain on the budget. Mr. Cameron left the Branch in 1952 after the trapline registration process was completed. He is presently Sergeant At Arms of the Territorial Legislature.

Kjar came to the Yukon with the Alberta stockman's attitude towards wolves. During this eight years as Director, Kjar maintained this attitude to the extent that much of his energy and travel budget was devoted to the business of poisoning wolves. In one of his first letters to the Commissioner, Kjar asked for a supplemental sum of \$1300 to try out a new spring-loaded cyanide 'bomb', which stockmen in the United States and Alberta had found effective against coyotes and wolves.³ That he was encouraged in this by the Fish and Game Association is shown by a letter from Dr. Hugh Bostock to the Comptroller. Writing about the general decline in Yukon game, Bostock said of the Association, "There are a number of intelligent men there interested in the subject, though the crowd still blame the wolves".⁴ Kjar was able to obtain additional appropriations solely for the purpose of predator control in later years. This was because the Wolf Bounty Ordinance of 1944 (Ord. Y.T. 1944, ch.14) was repealed in 1952, and the Council may have felt that some control was necessary.

The predator control programs initiated by Kjar had only limited success. Sometimes the poisoned baits took more foxes, coyotes, wolverines, ravens, eagles and whiskey jacks than they did wolves. His predator control reports make dismal reading. It should be borne in mind that Yukoners

in the Twenties, Thirties and Forties did not use poison. It was illegal under any circumstances. Those who did were turned in by informants and usually convicted. The belief that strychnine would kill through seven removes, i.e. animals feeding on animals killed by the poison, has been part of Yukon wildlife lore for at least 50 years. R.C.M.P. Sgt. Harper wrote in Dawson in 1920, "The Indians have a great dread of poison and never use it and are dead against it." ⁵ In 1953, Kjar personally placed 20 bait stations on lakes along a 4000 mile flight path, using methods developed by the Alaska Fish and Game Branch. He took 21 wolves.⁶ G.I. Cameron did not agree with this policy, he felt like many others, that "wolves have their place in the scheme of things."

But Kjar had other interests in Yukon wildlife management besides wolves. He brought a vital, outsider's viewpoint to a resource that Yukoners had taken for granted for fifty years and that by 1950, was in an apparent decline. Kjar saw that for the wildlife to hold its own, it had to help pay its own way. Other chapters of this report show Kjar's involvement in the plantation of elk and bison, and his role in promoting the big game industry through his friend James Bond, the publicist and big game hunter.

Kjar composed preliminary drafts of Game Ordinance amendments, trapline registration and other regulations for the administration. He also wrote directly to members of Council asking them to propose specific amendments, probably because the administration did not wish to initiate them itself.⁷ Kjar worked closely with Dr. Dewey Soper of the Canadian Wildlife Service in setting up a muskrat trapping program within Kluane Sanctuary, at Koidern Flats. This had been started by Indian Affairs as a delayed reaction to the fur market collapse in 1948.

Kjar replaced the R.C.M.P. in initiating proceedings against violators of the Game Ordinance. For many years he resorted to road blocks and vehicle searches on Yukon highways. This had never been done before, nor has it been done since. According to Bill Harris of Minto, also Joe Jacquot and Johnny Johns, Kjar's zealous approach to enforcement did not make him very popular. Another aspect of Kjar's work was replying to the scores of enquiries from would-be tourists and hunters. After Bond's Yukon publicity tours, the flow of enquiries became a flood, nearly four thousand a year in the early Fifties.

Kjar made several trips outside the Yukon on speaking engagements, some of which coincided with his annual leave. He addressed Fish and Game Association meetings and showed movies of the Yukon. He encouraged the export of live Yukon animals such as wolverine, lynx, marten, beaver and many others to zoological gardens and private collectors. This was during a time of low fur prices; live animals represented a valuable sale commodity for trappers. Similarly Kjar supervised the live trapping and removal of beaver whose dams threatened roads, or who were themselves threatened by gold dredging in the Klondike.

The Canadian Wildlife Service provided biological services to the Territorial Government. During the early Fifties Dr. Dewey Soper and later Dr. W.A. Fuller came to the Yukon on a regular basis. Frequently these men would undertake wildlife surveys along rivers and roads, and were often accompanied by Kjar. Soper and Fuller advised Ottawa on Yukon wildlife conditions and maintained the Federal Government's continuing interest in these matters. Fuller made a month-long survey of the success of the elk plantation near Braeburn in 1955. In 1957, Fuller was posted to the Yukon from his previous

base in Fort Smith, and set up the first Canadian Wildlife Service office in the Yukon. Part of Fuller's budget was used in predator control programs, in conjunction with the Game Branch.

Them Kjar resigned his position early in 1957. Geoff Bidlake was appointed Acting Director in April 1957 from his previous position as Territorial Licence Inspector. In the eight years that Kjar was Director, revenue from licences and taxes on wildlife increased from 22,000 to nearly 30,000 dollars. The Branch's expenditures had been consistently below its appropriation, even though the appropriations had declined in later years. In fact, the Branch's share of the Territorial Government operations and maintenance budget declined from two percent down to less than one percent; it stayed that way until 1975.

Bidlake had been a long-time Yukon resident and Territorial Government employee. He held the position as Director for two years but failing health forced him to resign in 1959. Prior to the appointment of Mr. J.B. Fitzgerald in 1960, Game Branch office affairs were handled by Mrs. E.M. Warren. The two-year period of Bidlake's directorship marked an important change in Branch activities.

Changes to the Game Ordinance in 1958 firmly established the outfitting business as the principal economic activity concerning Yukon game. Outfitters registered their areas beginning in July 1958 and by 1959 had made a dramatic increase in their business. Their association was a powerful lobby. The summer of 1958 was one of the worst in memory for forest fires in the Yukon. Forests over the whole of the Yukon were closed to all uses, including hunting. However, outfitters obtained a specific exemption to the forest closure in order

to carry on their businesses.⁸ In the fall of 1958, the outfitters met with Bidlake, the Commissioner and Dr. Fuller of the Wildlife Service to discuss problems of the industry. From this meeting came a list of standard equipment that each outfitter should have in order to maintain his licence.⁹ The annual inspection of this equipment and other services in support of the outfitting industry have been important activities of the Game Branch since that date.

Starting in the Fifties, Al Oeming of the Alberta Game Farm had purchased live fur bearing animals from Yukon trappers. He obtained much assistance from Them Kjar in this, and the Branch under Geoff Bidlake continued the cooperation. Oeming maintained such a steady correspondence with the Branch - sending a box of cigars at one point - that one could conclude Oeming was turning a good profit on the resale of these animals. By the spring of 1959, the Branch became involved with a dispute between Oeming and the Edmonton Zoological Society over permission to export live Dall sheep from the Yukon. Ottawa preferred that any sheep taken should go to Edmonton, and not to Oeming. But since wildlife is a Yukon resource, Oeming was given a permit.¹⁰

The Game Branch's attitude towards the export of live animals, especially sheep, stems from Oeming's capture of Dall sheep in the Kluane area. Two lambs died through inadequate care and preparation, and too much handling.¹¹ Today the Branch is reluctant to permit the capture of live animals until it is satisfied as to personnel, methods of capture and the ultimate destination of the animals.

The Game Branch in the Sixties

J.B. (Fitz) Fitzgerald was appointed Director of the Game Branch in 1960. Fitzgerald had been Staff Sergeant with

the Whitehorse Detachment of the R.C.M.P. for several years, and had come to the Yukon in the early Fifties. He took over a Branch consisting of himself and the secretary, Mrs. Waddington. The Branch boasted one vehicle, a 17 foot freighter canoe and a trailer to haul it. For publicity, the Branch owned six films mostly dealing with Yukon hunting and wildlife, that it would loan to outside agencies for publicity purposes. The Branch operated on a budget of 16,372 dollars for fiscal 1960/1961. Former Director Geoff Bidlake returned to the Branch as Assistant Director in 1964, but his failing health caused his retirement in 1968. He passed away in the same year. The present Branch Secretary Josephine Fehr joined in 1965.

Territorial Council introduced a wolf bounty for the third time in 1960. Bounties had been offered in the years 1929 to 1933, and 1944 to 1952. The Branch administered this program and kept up the predator control programs initiated by Kjar in the Fifties. Fitzgerald was assisted in predator control work by Dr. Art Pearson, who re-opened the Canadian Wildlife Service office in Whitehorse in 1962. Pearson replaced Dr. Fuller who left the Yukon in 1960 after nearly three years of residence. Hunters did not seem to take advantage of the bounty. Between the bounty and the poisoning programs, about 100 wolves per year were taken at the beginning, rising to between 150 and 200 per year at the end of the decade. The bounty and predator programs were discontinued in 1971.

The big game industry underwent rapid growth beginning in 1959. The growth brought a corresponding increase in Branch activities in support of the industry. For the first time, complaints by non-resident hunters against the outfitter began to arrive at the Branch. For example, of the 191 alien

hunters in the 1961 season, 13 complained to Fitzgerald about unsatisfactory hunts. These complaints centered on overcrowding by the outfitters and the resulting lack of game, poor preparation and indifferent service. Fitzgerald felt that the outfitters were over-extending themselves. He was concerned because wages offered to guides and assistants were too low. He wanted to see the outfitters raise their daily rates substantially and reduce the competition between themselves.¹² The 1961 season was by then the largest in terms of hunters, being nearly double that for 1960.

Conditions did not improve for many years. Complaints of a general nature and against specific outfitters continued to arrive at the Branch. Hunters blamed crowding, run-down camps and equipment, liquor and general incompetence for spoiling what was for them a major investment. One Swiss gentleman, a banker, said that as president of Switzerland's oldest hunting club, he could no longer recommend the Yukon as a place to hunt.¹³ Budget and staff limitations prevented Fitzgerald from making consistent and thorough inspections of the outfitter's equipment and camps, in addition to other patrol and enforcement duties. He wrote the Commissioner in December 1965:

"From comments made to the writer and information picked up while travelling through the Territory, the general public is now starting to wonder what the condition of our game population will be in a few years and just what its condition is at the moment....it would seem that our Game Department will have to come up with some answers fairly soon.....this can only be done by taking on proper personnel under our jurisdiction."

14

For the first ten years of Fitzgerald's tenure as director, Game Branch appropriations varied between 25,000 and 60,000 dollars. The appropriation was consistently underspent as

is shown in Table 3. During this time the Game Branch share of Territorial operations and maintenance expenditures dropped from one-half percent down to a low of one-tenth of a percent in 1969. Revenues supervised and collected by the Branch, including licences, fees and fur export taxes, always exceeded expenditures. Fitzgerald's careful budget management seemed to work against him when he sought to increase the role of the Game Branch in the Yukon.

The Game Branch in the Seventies

As of December 1976, the Yukon Territorial Game Branch has grown into a department with 21 employees and a budget of over half a million dollars. This growth has been compressed into the past five years. In 1970, four Conservation Officers were on staff with detachments opened in Watson Lake and Haines Junction, as well as Whitehorse. The position of Game Branch Biologist was created by the 1972/1973 appropriation and filled in September 1972. Other staff positions were created in each of 1974, 1975 and 1976. Conservation Officers have been posted at Dawson City, Mayo, Watson Lake, Haines Junction and Ross River. As of December 1976 the staff positions are Director, Chief Conservation Officer, eight Conservation Officers, seven Biologists, Fur bearer technician, Administrative Officer and three secretarial-clerical positions. After achieving this remarkable growth in the Department, Mr. Fitzgerald retired as Director in October 1976. The position is presently unfilled.

The Yukon Territorial Game Branch is the only Yukon Government department that administers a natural resource. Lands, forests, fisheries and minerals are under Federal control. The administration of the other Yukon resources impinges on the management of its wildlife, consequently the Game Branch has obtained representation on several intergovernmental committees

concerned with land use. However these committees are advisory only; decisions regarding the allocation or manner of development of natural resources are not made by the Game Branch.

Developments such as pipelines, hydroelectric installations or mines occur at the expense of wildlife. Even though the Branch's role is merely advisory, it must attempt to gather as much knowledge as possible about the wildlife habitat affected by that development, and make recommendations to minimize its impact. Consequently, the Branch's budget for research is allocated not to Branch priorities, but to the priorities of others: yet these others, deriving benefit from the research, pay little or nothing for it. Despite a dramatically increased budget the funds and manpower of the Branch seem unable to keep it one step ahead of developments planned for the Yukon in the near future.

Game Branch biologists have some projects which are a reaction - at least in part - to planned resource developments while others arise from wildlife management needs. Every summer at Old Crow, a Branch biologist carries on a waterfowl survey with some research on fur bearers and caribou, in conjunction with the Canadian Wildlife Service. While the information obtained is desirable and valuable, the need for it arose from the interest of the oil companies in exploring Crow Flats. Other biologists are assigned during the summer to river surveys, making inventories of wildlife and habitat conditions along certain rivers. These rivers are ones under investigation for hydroelectric development or large-scale placer mining. Biological field research frequently takes years to complete; uncompleted research may be virtually useless. Research which is essentially a reaction to a

proposed resource development may not be compatible with the long-term needs of wildlife management in the Yukon.

The Game Branch has three divisions in its structure, Conservation Officers, Biological staff and Administration. The Chief Conservation Officer supervises the work of officers at detachments in Yukon communities. This person has responsibility to initiate proceedings against violations of the Game Ordinance and works closely with the Crown Attorney on some cases. This person also prepares drafts of amendments to the Ordinance or to Regulations. Conservation Officers are posted at most Yukon communities. Their responsibilities are to enforce the Game Ordinance and the Fisheries Regulations. They represent the Branch in each community and are agents for the issuance of licences, seals and tags. Their other duties are to report on wildlife conditions in their area and to assist biological staff in their work. Conservation Officers act on complaints concerning wildlife and where funds permit, make deterrent patrols.

Included in the Conservation section are the public education programs. The Hunter Safety Training Course given in most Yukon schools emphasizes firearm safety, survival training, first aid, boating safety and field dressing of game. A second course is supported by an audio-visual presentation and teaches field dressing. These courses help to educate the public as to the appreciation, management and wise use of the Yukon's wildlife.

The biologist section of the Branch has personnel for specific areas of research, in addition to the Crow Flats and rivers surveys mentioned above. One biologist processes returned questionnaires sent to all licenced hunters for information

on game harvest. In addition, this person measures and records data on biological specimens such as age, size, location, and in the case of female moose, reproductive history. Another biologist has responsibility for caribou, both barren-ground and woodland, and for problems in their management posed by developments such as the Dempster Highway. Fur bearing animals are the responsibility of another biologist. This person is seeking management proposals for traplines that may involve area-specific data on fur harvests using computers, regulatory changes which could require seals on all pelts, and public information programs. The management proposals aim to increase trapper incentive. The Game Branch is educating trappers in fur handling techniques, harvest methods, and other means of increasing both trapper efficiency and the total fur harvest. The Fur Bearer technician maintains fur statistics and administers trapline registrations and regulations.

Branch biologists share responsibility to manage all Yukon wildlife. Certain specific animals and birds are assigned to each biologist, who then handles all enquiries, occurrences such as nuisance animals, reports of sickness and so on. One biologist with forestry training has responsibility for wildlife habitat. Working with the Canadian Centre for Remote Sensing, this person is compiling maps of the Yukon from satellite imagery that will give much information on vegetation and wildlife habitat. In addition to the above, biologists may be assigned to specific projects for short periods. The Branch encourages its staff to submit their research results for publication in professional journals.

The Administration section of the Branch has responsibility over Branch budget matters. Like any government department, the Branch estimates its budget for the coming year and

submits it to the Legislature for amendment or approval. Expenditures are grouped into their budget class as they are made, and are balanced monthly, giving very detailed cost control for management efficiency. If the 'vote' or budget is exceeded for any reason, the Territorial administration has to approach the Legislature for a supplemental amount. The Branch collects considerable revenue each year from sale of licences, fees and so on. All costs of collecting this revenue such as salaries, commissions, printing and so on, are borne by the Branch while the revenue itself goes directly to Consolidated Revenue. While it has never been Territorial Government policy to have the Game Branch 'pay its own way', attempts to increase revenues under the Game Ordinance or the Fur Export Tax Ordinance would require some re-allocation of the Branch budget, or modifications in its programs. In any case both the design of the Branch budget and its management for the year are as much a part of the Branch's operations as the work of the Conservation Officers and the Biologists.

This chapter has described the growth of the Yukon Game Branch from 1949 to 1976. For most of that 27 year period the Branch experienced slow growth. It coincided with a time when the Yukon seem preoccupied with the growth of the mining industry and the building of roads. Until 1949, the Yukon's wildlife provided both partial subsistence and a means of support for many Yukoners. Game Branch administrative policies in the Fifties and Sixties seemed to emphasize the non-resident or trophy hunting industry. This use of wildlife was not incompatible with either the low level of resident hunting or road building and mine development. Secondly, fur prices were generally low and there was little interest in trapping as a livelihood. However in recent years, the Game Branch has had to react to population increases and to decisions

about Yukon resource development made by others. It has had to expand its research and inventory operations and to increase its role as a resource administrator.

Note to Chapter 7

1. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 'Export Permits'; December 1910.
2. ibid; File 12-20; Jan. 13, 1944.
3. ibid; File 12-23; Oct. 25, 1949.
4. ibid; File 12-22; Dec. 8, 1946.
5. ibid; File 12-3; Apr. 1920.
6. 'Wildlife Management in the Yukon Territory'; mimeo, n.d.; in Central Records box 5015; File 'Game Management'.
7. Yukon Archives Temporary Series 3; File 12-23; Oct. 20, 1950.
8. Central Records Box 5012; 'Conservation'; July 15, 1958.
9. ibid; Box 5015; 'Yukon Outfitters Association'; Oct. 20, 1958.
10. ibid; Box 5012; 'Alberta Game Farm'; May, 1959.
11. ibid; June, 1959.
12. ibid; Box 5015; 'Yukon Outfitters Assoc.'; Oct. 1961.
13. ibid; Jan. 1964.
14. ibid; Box 5015; 'Hunters-Complaints'; Dec. 30, 1965.

CONCLUSION

This report has shown the central role of Yukon Indian people in the use of wildlife for subsistence and for a means of livelihood. Indians have always followed the provisions of the Game Ordinance which regulated economic activity such as trapping, but they have also exercised their right to take game for food at any time. Yukon Game laws and policies have been either imposed on Indian people, or they have existed in uneasy equilibrium with their traditional hunting rights. Present game law makes a distinction between status and non-status Indians. Land claims negotiations by the Council of Yukon Indians may remove this distinction between the peoples it represents. Consequently the Game Ordinance will present an anomaly. Two sets of game laws - one Indian, one non-Indian - would be divisive to the Yukon community. The next few years must inevitably see the creation of a new Game Ordinance.

In the years ahead, the Game Branch and the Territorial Government must make certain critical decisions respecting land use, wildlife economic activity and wildlife populations. Many Yukoners - both Indians and non-Indians - will strongly resist attempts to make them more dependent upon a wage economy by depriving them of access to wildlife. Their style of land utilization is in obvious and direct conflict with government policies which seek to maximize annual dollar earnings per unit of land area. If the wonderful abundance and variety of Yukon wildlife is to continue for generations, this land use conflict must be resolved.

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL TABLES

NOTES TO TABLES

- a. Includes sale of confiscated pelts and fur-related permits, 1924-1929.
- b. All Game Branch revenue directly attributed to non-resident hunting during the fiscal year, from Non-Resident Hunter Report.
- c. No licences issued prior to 1920; optional to 1934; \$25.00 licence abolished 1947: included general (trapping) licence in later years; seals and fishing licenses from 1972.
- d. From all sources under various game ordinances as appearing in Commissioner's Report from 1952; earlier years compiled from Public Accounts.
- e. Figures from Table 2 and Public Accounts.
- f. After Commissioners Report.
- g. Does not include game taken by trappers.
- h. After G. Lortie, Game Harvest Report February 1976; includes an estimate of unreported trapper kill.
- i. After Canada Year Book by year; J. Jack, Fur Activity in the Yukon Territory, September 1976 for fiscal 1967/68 onwards.
- j. Includes big game, spring bear licences for all non-residents, excludes bird licences.
- k. All guides licences sold except 1952-1958 guides B and C classes only.
- l. Revenue described in note "b" above, divided by number taken.
- m. Revenue described in note "d" above, divided by total taken.

TABLE 1

YUKON POPULATION AND PRICE INDEX, BY YEAR

Year	Population	Consumer Price Index	
		1949= 100	1961= 100
1901	27,219		
1911	8,512	49.5 (1913)	
1921	4,157	82.4	
1926	-	75.8	
1931	4,230	67.8	
1936	-	61.1	
1941	4,914	69.6	
1946	-	77.5	
1951	9,096	113.7	
1956	12,190	118.1	
1961	14,628	128. (1960)	100
1966	14,382	142.(est.)	111
1971	18,388	170.(est.)	133
1976	21,631		

Sources: Canada Year Book 1973-1974; Historical Statistics of Canada,
M.C. Urquart ed., Toronto, MacMillan, 1965; p. 304.

TABLE 2

GAME BRANCH REVENUES FROM 1920

<u>Fiscal Year</u> <u>Ending in</u>	<u>Fur Export</u> <u>Tax (a)</u>	<u>Non-Resident</u> <u>Revenues (b)</u>	<u>Resident</u> <u>Revenues (c)</u>	<u>Trapping</u> <u>Trading</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Revenue (d)</u>
1920	1138	2300			3438
1921	4053	3420	2025	1145	10,643
1922	6719	3875	975	1140	12,709
1923	6460	2330	625	1200	10,615
1924	9366	2415	500	1190	13,471
1925	12,539	1325	525	820	15,209
1926	12,057	1500	425	1325	15,307
1927	12,588	2325	475	1340	16,728
1928	12,476	2805	550	1390	17,221
1929	12,642	5885	625	1420	20,572
1930	10,075	3870	450	1695	16,090
1931	8791	1120	675	1295	11,881
1932	7636	920	475	1095	10,126
1933	12,055	755	225	825	13,860
1934	12,033	765	1203	1230	15,231
1935	9724	545	1010	955	12,234
1936	10,115	1505	631	840	13,091
1937	9528	1645	784	1000	12,957
1938	10,872	2020	797	1908	15,597
1939	10,838	795	589	2760	14,982
1940	8862	1325	610	3174	13,971
1941	9390	1400	578	2976	14,344
1942	8490	1970	667	3208	14,335
1943	7191	90	1427	1646	10,354
1944	7489	2125	1123	2396	13,133
1945	8600		All licences \$5339		13,939
1946	10,619		All licences \$5410		16,029
1947	8921		All licences \$11,613		20,534
1948	9296		All licences \$9373		18,669
1949	11,313	(4,680)	All licences sold \$7282		18,595

Table 2 (cont'd)

Fiscal Year Ending in	Fur Export Tax	Non-Resident Revenues	Resident Revenues	Trapping Trading	Total Revenue
1950	10,572	(9,230)	All licences sold	\$12,186	22,758
1951	11,563	(7,405)	All licences sold	\$11,933	23,496
1952	13,007	(10,240)	All licences sold	\$16,173	29,180
1953	10,342	10,840	5646	1875	29,023
1954	7591	10,740	5960	2695	28,964
1955	8180	10,640	3952	2625	25,339
1956	9344	13,190	3690	2363	29,010
1957	7089	13,670	3584	2112	26,443
1958	5556	14,705	2830	2062	24,900
1959	5197	9165	3446	2325	20,653
1960	5568	13,525	4411	1761	26,098
1961	4583	16,025	4604	566	25,954
1962	4464	23,385	4970	462	32,303
1963	4161	18,691	5731	568	29,162
1964	6378	20,050	5405	2308	34,150
1965	4378	24,092	5035	1282	34,816
1966	2979	29,120	4658	714	37,481
1967	2921	29,325	4752	491	37,523
1968	2995	26,479	10,149	572	43,166
1969	2922	32,910	10,313	1449	47,741
1970	3475	38,635	14,202	1261	57,762
1971	2448	42,325	16,171	839	61,930
1972	1817	63,160	15,743	737	98,742
1973	2206	62,000	46,482	1212	133,396
1974	3349	67,836	57,631	1388	155,722
1975	2783	69,740	62,682	1355	156,688
1976	1650	126,827	67,027	1383	221,166
1977					
1978					
1979					
1980					
1981					
1982					
1983					

TABLE 3

GAME BRANCH BUDGET FROM 1950^(e)

<u>Fiscal Year</u> <u>Ending in</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Revenue</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>Expenditure</u>	<u>Total YTG</u> <u>Expenditure(O&M)</u>	<u>% for</u> <u>Game Br.</u>
1950	22,758	22,000	12,047	722,494	1.66
1951	23,496	25,900	18,449	847,778	2.17
1952	29,180	21,550	18,270	1,115,415	1.63
1953	29,023	25,060	19,671	1,020,269	1.92
1954	28,964	16,500	15,043	1,195,215	1.28
1955	25,339	14,685	13,777	1,267,864	1.08
1956	29,010	-	14,160	1,608,005	0.88
1957	26,443	-	14,939	1,679,117	0.88
1958	24,900	-	13,552	1,910,088	0.70
1959	20,653	-	14,026	2,638,640	0.53
1960	26,098	-	18,197	2,671,230	0.68
1961	25,954	-	16,372	3,149,975	0.51
1962	32,303	-	18,771	3,447,547	0.54
1963	29,162	26,707	17,892	4,482,642	0.39
1964	34,150	34,248	28,458	5,074,226	0.56
1965	34,816	36,020	31,245	6,170,036	0.50
1966	37,481	34,865	34,243	6,756,118	0.50
1967	37,523	40,350	35,627	8,147,147	0.43
1968	43,166	62,697	38,372	9,397,741	0.40
1969	47,741	27,920	14,835	11,316,153	0.13
1970	57,762	29,862	29,223	13,602,323	0.21
1971	61,930	59,374	59,372	16,098,612	0.36
1972	98,742	146,305	146,305	25,683,434	0.56
1973	133,396	225,283	225,283	27,319,614	0.82
1974	155,722	295,000	294,601	33,589,909	0.87
1975	156,688	440,115	440,115	37,958,675	1.15
1976	221,166	517,686	517,686	44,494,696	1.16
1977					
1978					
1979					
1980					

TABLE 4

TOTAL YUKON GAME TAKEN BY FISCAL YEAR^(f)

YEAR	MOOSE	CARIBOU	SHEEP	GOAT	BLACK BEAR	GRIZZLY BEAR
1952	244	1111	62	7	32	57
1953 ^(g)	66	330	50	11	38	39
1953/54	302	1846	79	17	57	67
1954/55	241	1457	86	9	107	73
1955/56	369	1670	146	17	106	86
1956/57	370	1662	105	18	106	80
1957/58	396	809	151	14	105	71
1958/59	491	1117	125	21	111	65
1959/60	540	1202	126	16	162	73
1960/61	890	1380	158	16	135	80
1961/62	726	1044	170	18	108	86
1962/63	796	1757	216	24	160	127
1963/64	901	1470	223	36	134	117
1964/65	884	1544	262	27	151	131
1965/66	883	1233	282	39	122	135
1966/67	714	1138	230	38	124	84
1967/68	801	983	252	45	120	80
1968/69	894	1317	243	22	125	128
1969/70	1036	1094	261	38	136	113
1970/71	1013	1222	325	48	112	107
1971/72	826	1401	288	62	74	102
1972/73	813	1149	280	54	115	119
1973/74	1470	1571	309	60	113	127
1974/75	1637	1316	313	31	121	125
1975/76 ^(h)	1574	1234	265	25	88	101
1976/77						
1977/78						
1978/79						
1979/80						

TABLE 5
YUKON FUR PRODUCTION⁽¹⁾

Fiscal Year	No. of Pelts Sold	Value of Production	Fur Export Tax Paid \$	Ratio x 100 Tax/Value
1920/21	16,125	78,189	4053	5.2
1921/22	69,796	203,402	6719	3.3
1922/23	46,198	199,522	6460	3.2
1923/24	50,070	347,079	9366	2.7
1924/25	36,616	309,549	12,539	4.1
1925/26	35,767	320,803	12,057	3.8
1926/27	25,991	382,261	12,588	3.3
1927/28	64,375	610,348	12,476	2.0
1928/29	35,736	484,919	12,642	2.6
1929/30	108,632	295,492	10,075	3.4
1930/31	61,832	145,224	8791	6.1
1931/32	57,679	132,268	7636	5.8
1932/33	52,282	146,055	12,055	8.3
1933/34	43,803	122,999	12,033	9.8
1934/35	41,309	230,074	9724	4.2
1935/36	42,768	276,946	10,115	3.7
1936/37	50,308	347,558	9528	2.7
1937/38	67,655	295,857	10,872	3.7
1938/39	77,475	267,721	10,838	4.0
1939/40	80,617	288,292	8862	3.1
1940/41	70,953	373,399	9390	2.5
1941/42	66,700	398,132	8490	2.1
1942/43	52,897	338,035	7191	2.1
1943/44	78,005	467,188	7489	1.6
1944/45	87,292	669,217	8600	1.3
1945/46	107,252	677,495	10,619	1.6
1946/47	58,777	373,176	8921	2.4
1947/48	131,227	230,177	9296	4.0
1948/49	151,969	143,810	11,313	7.9
1949/50	153,574	199,086	10,572	5.3
1950/51	228,616	361,969	11,563	3.2

Fiscal Year	No. of Pelts Sold	Value of Production	Fur Export Tax Paid \$	Ratio x 100 Tax/Value
1951/52	171,274	173,252	13,007	7.5
1952/53	246,379	247,001	10,342	4.2
1953/54	176,338	182,238	7,591	4.2
1954/55	213,515	242,944	8180	3.4
1955/56	109,576	155,777	9344	6.0
1956/57	108,102	108,873	7089	6.5
1957/58	110,512	118,607	5556	4.7
1958/59	103,604	67,571	5197	7.7
1959/60	182,982	158,232	5568	3.5
1960/61	116,787	105,031	4583	4.7
1961/62	98,902	125,348	4464	3.6
1962/63	259,137	846,420	4161	0.5
1963/64	86,394	171,209	6378	3.7
1964/65	70,995	172,936	4378	2.5
1965/66	22,308	64,929	2979	4.9
1966/67	43,915	92,837	2921	3.1
1967/68	56,483	81,234	2995	3.7
1968/69	54,300	104,612	2922	2.8
1969/70	26,850	70,673	3475	4.9
1970/71	13,891	44,762	2448	5.5
1971/72	21,340	136,007	1817	1.3
1972/73	41,045	339,437	2206	0.6
1973/74	34,684	499,001	3349	0.7
1974/75	30,905	403,543	2783	0.7
1975/76	28,851	363,073	1650	0.6
1976/77				
1977/78				
1978/79				
1979/80				

TABLE 6

NON-RESIDENT BIG GAME HUNTING FROM 1946

Season	No. Licences ^(j)	Moose	Caribou	Sheep	Goat	Bears	Outfitters	Guides ^(k)	Total Revenue \$ ^(b)
1946	70	16	12	12	-	9	0	37	7,915
1947	50	19	21	32	6	44	8		11,563
1948	41	11	14	29	1	25	5	23	4,680
1949	80	34	19	55	17	57	9	45	9,230
1950	60	24	13	44	3	44	10	41	7,405
1951	93	33	36	68	5	53	9	47	10,240
1952	74	25	25	35	2	41	10	36	10,840
1953	68	24	27	36	8	32	10	35	10,740
1954	64	32	40	45	3	35	7	36	10,640
1955	81	29	46	68	6	50	11	46	13,190
1956	85	35	38	53	9	37	11	42	13,670
1957	98	47	31	81	5	49	11	54	14,705
1958	83	34	33	65	6	52	15	51	9,165
1959	118	42	46	80	7	59	18	62	13,525
1960	133	50	56	88	9	64	16	77	16,025
1961	209	86	72	149	8	65	17	94	23,385
1962	164	60	69	109	5	60	20	81	18,691
1963	178	67	55	134	13	87	17	77	20,050
1964	210	75	106	147	9	68	21	90	24,092

Season	No. licences	Moose	Caribou	Sheep	Goat	Bears	Outfitters	Guides	Revenue
1965	260	108	106	168	17	97	22	129	29,120
1966	264	107	136	159	28	55	22	118	29,325
1967	278	103	134	159	26	56	22	119	26,479
1968	306	112	117	167	6	87	22	124	32,910
1969	351	157	124	183	19	87	23	131	38,635
1970	393	161	161	225	19	94	21	143	42,325
1971	417	176	186	210	42	94	22	161	63,160
1972	401	147	139	207	32	96	20	150	62,000
1973	347	193	176	228	27	121	17	153	67,836
1974	463	192	176	241	20	93	23	149	69,740
1975	386	152	141	194	16	83	22	133	126,827
1976									
1977									
1978									
1979									
1980									

119

TABLE 7GOVERNMENT REVENUE VALUE OF BIG GAME

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Non-Resident Trophies Taken</u>	<u>Game Br. Rev.⁽¹⁾ per trophy, \$</u>	<u>Total Y.T. Kill</u>	<u>Total Game Branch^(m) rev.per animal, \$</u>
1946/47	49	161.00	unknown	-
1950/51	128	57.85	unknown	-
1955/56	199	66.28	2394	12.11
1960/61	267	60.01	2659	9.76
1965/66	496	58.71	2704	13.86
1970/71	660	64.12	2827	21.90
1975/76	586	216.43	3287	67.28

TABLE NO. 8

Open Seasons for Yukon Game

Animal	Northwest	Revised Ordinances and Consolidations to						1971-1976
	Game Act (1894)	1902	1920	1938	1947	1951	1958	
Moose) July 16 to) Sept. 31) and) Oct. 1 to) Dec. 31) Aug. 1 to) Mar. 1) Aug. 1 to) Mar. 1	Aug. 1- Dec. 1	Aug. 1- Nov. 30	-----By Commissioner's Regulations (various, by Commissioner's Regulations)	Aug. 1- Oct. 31
Deer) Dec. 1 to) Mar. 31))))))))))))))	closed	closed		closed
Caribou))))))))))))))))	Aug. 1 - Dec. 1	Aug. 1- Jan. 31		Aug. 1 Oct. 31
Sheep))))))))))))))))	"	Aug. 1- Nov. 30		Aug. 1- Oct. 31
Goat))))))))))))))))	"	"		Various
Bear	open	open	open	open	open	open		1 May- 15 June Aug. 1-Oct. 31
Upland Fowl	Sept. 1- Dec. 31	Oct. 1- Jan. 15	Sept. 1- Mar. 15	Sept. 1- Feb. 1	Sept. 1- Jan. 31	Sept. 1- Oct. 31		Sept. 1- Nov. 30
Waterfowl	Sept. 1- Jan. 15	Sept. 1- May 31	Aug. 15- Dec. 15	Sept. 1- Nov. 1	Sept. 1- Nov. 1	Sept. 1- Oct. 31		Sept. 1- Oct. 31

121

TABLE NO. 9

Ordinary Seasonal Bag Limits for Yukon Residents

Animal	Northwest Game Act (1894)	Revised Ordinances and Consolidations to					1971-1976
		1902	1920	1938	1947	1951	
Moose	n.l.	6	2	2	1	1	1
Deer	n.l.	6	6	6	closed	closed	closed
Caribou	n.l.	n.l.	6	6	5	5	1
Sheep	n.l.	n.l.	2	2	1	1	1
Goat	n.l.	n.l.	2	2	1	1	1
Bear	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	2
Upland Fowl	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	15/day	30	30	30
Waterfowl	n.l.	n.l.	n.l.	by Treaty,.....) Federal Act.....)			By Treaty, Federal Act

By Commissioner's Regulation-

(Various, by Commissioner's Regulation)

122

