

I wonder whether the minister has acquired any new outlook or attitude on this question as a result of his recent visits to New Zealand and Australia. One part of this bill relates to the acquisition and recording of mineral claims. It refers to the method to be used and the individuals who may acquire claims. It contains a proviso which exempts certain lands from being staked for mineral claims. It makes it clear that you cannot stake mineral claims on any lands to which the National Parks Act applies. It also makes it clear that you cannot stake a mineral claim on any land used as a cemetery or a burial ground. It goes on to refer to other applications of this exemption principle.

One can search in vain for a proviso in this bill which prevents anyone from staking and applying the full jurisdiction of this act to land that might be occupied by Indians. I suggest this is indeed regrettable and a revealing feature of this legislation. This is not confined solely to the Yukon Territory. This is much more pointed in respect of the Yukon Territory than it is in respect of British Columbia, Labrador or Ontario, because the Yukon has a common boundary with one of the newer states of the United States, namely the state of Alaska, which up until recently held the status of a territory. I cannot help but wonder what the Indian people of the Yukon are thinking about the attitude and ideas being displayed by the government of Canada compared to those being discussed in the United States Congress.

Although the matter has not been finalized, there is a concrete proposal before Congress that involves the payment of something in the order of \$1 billion to the aboriginal inhabitants of the state of Alaska for their rights to that land. The proposal provides that there shall be hundreds of thousands of acres set aside for their continued use and over which they will have jurisdiction. It provides that under these arrangements the natives will receive royalty payments as a result of the exploitation of the resources on and beneath the ground. When this arrangement is completed, these people will not have to care whether the Anvil Mining Corporation or other mineral companies hire them. They will have some rights and resources which will stem from their basic heritage in that land which they and their forefathers occupied long before we came.

● (4:30 p.m.)

So far as I am concerned, when we deal with this bill, we re-emphasize what is the greatest Canadian shame. We have absolutely refused, so far as the government is concerned, to recognize that those people have any rights, that they were here before those people to whom we so often refer as the founding peoples of Canada. These are rights which should be recognized as being more basic than the constitutional rights of French-speaking people, English-speaking people or people of any other language in Canada. One of my basic objections to a bill of this kind is that it turns over, so far as the exploitation of minerals is concerned, to any individual 18 years of age

Yukon Minerals Act

or over on his own behalf or on behalf of any corporation authorized to carry on business, the territory for the staking of mineral claims, except in national parklands or other exempted parts of the land, without any consideration at all of the idea of there ever having been a human being on this continent before the colonialists, be they French or English, arrived here.

Since we are talking about land near Alaska, I suppose I should say "or be they Russian". Perhaps getting that close to home I should say "or be they Spanish", but as we know the Spanish heritage is left in Canada only in the form of a number of place names which grace the province of British Columbia. Part of the name of my constituency is one such name. "Alberni" comes from "Don Pedro Alberni". So, we can forget about the colonialists from Spain and from Moscow, and think in terms of the fact that we, as a result of our rights in a sovereign state, are the inheritors of the colonizing regime of Britain and France. As I have said before in this House, while Britain and France have been doing something about unwinding their colonialism in Africa and Asia, we in Canada who are the inheritors of the colonizing regime are doing nothing to recognize the basic rights and basic freedoms of the people who were here before our colonial ancestors arrived.

Nothing in this bill gives any recognition of the fact that there is a single Indian who is native to the Yukon Territory. We know there is not as high a percentage of Indian population at present in the Yukon Territory as there is in the Northwest Territories, but the principle is the same. To me, the situation is highlighted by the fact of the juxtaposition of the Yukon Territory to the State of Alaska. What I have in mind perhaps is not something which could be done in dealing with this legislation. I am not sure the act could be amended to recognize the situation I have tried to describe, although some of us may have a crack at it when the bill reaches the committee. This, of course, is a broader question which in large part lies beyond the scope of this bill. Certainly, however, it is highlighted by the manner in which the bill is drafted in respect of the right, in practical terms, of only a few larger corporations to exploit the natural resources which lie under the ground of the Yukon Territory. Apart from any other considerations involved, I think when we reach the committee stage of this bill I should like at least some consideration to be given to this particular aspect of it.

Mr. Stan Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Bill C-187, the Yukon minerals bill, I should like to comment at length on the new royalties which are proposed in this legislation and the adverse effect which these, if carried forth into law, will have upon the economy of the Yukon. In order to assess the full implications of these measures for the Yukon, I think it would be helpful if we were to turn our attention to that curious document published by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), which most of us had thought was a white paper on taxation but which we have been recently informed is merely a document containing some propos-