Yukon Minerals Act

areas will be part of the land management zones. I think this indicates something unhealthy about the legislation.

When we were discussing the government reorganizational bill we learned to our horror that the minister of environment was not going to be responsible for the environment or pollution in the Northwest Territories. This responsibility will reside mainly with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien). When we in this party spoke about that part of the reorganizational bill which deals with the environment, we insisted that the minister of environment should have his authority extended to cover the land part of Canada, if not the sea. Under this bill, decisions concerning the environment will be largely in the hands of mining appointees and engineers. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) made this point when he talked about the bureaucracy associated with these decisions. These mining appointees will probably not have sufficient guidelines spelled out and will operate largely on the basis of personal opinion.

Presumably the first part of these land use regulations, which none of us has seen, will be designed by mining engineers. Are mining engineers really capable of making judgments involving boreal ecological matters? If we leave the protection of our public lands in the hands of these mining engineers, it is essential that they clearly state their intentions. It must be clearly stated what the authority of these engineers is, the regulations they must follow and the extent to which they can go. We must remember that a mining engineer is also responsible for the construction of roads and airstrips. It is not only an exploration site which is subject to destruction, but also the access area to those sites. There is nothing to prevent exploration companies from building roads all over the north.

Mr. Nielsen: Or prospectors going in with hobnail boots.

Mr. Rose: That is right, destroying the tundra. That is a possibility and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) makes light of this. He should not be facetious about something so essential to the future of human life on this planet. People who are sensitive about ecological matters are often considered to be softheaded and sentimental.

We realize there must be a considerable amount of initiative, exploration and development in order to provide any kind of full employment or an economic base in Canada. We do not argue that point. The argument being made here is that we must do this with the least disruption possible. We must remember that about 60 per cent of the mines in the Yukon are owned by United States citizens and that about 60 per cent of production is exported. Why are we doing this? We must make up our minds.

An hon. Member: How much longer?

Mr. Rose: I have not very much time left. Let me say I do not believe a mining engineer should have jurisdiction beyond areas included in mining claims. We require specialists in ecology. There is a profound risk that public lands in Canada, owned by all the people, might be

exploited by being subject to single purpose uses. The people of Canada are subsidizing much of the activity in the north.

Mr. Nielsen: And in the provinces.

Mr. Rose: The north is not generating this activity for the benefit of the rest of the people.

Let me conclude by summarizing some of the things I have stated. I do not speak for other members of my party in this regard, but I personally object to the single resources concept, and that is what this bill is. I object to the fact that the Yukon Territory does not come within the authority of the minister of environment. We are concerned because there is lack of appreciation for aboriginal rights. We are concerned because the land use regulations are still to be published in final form. We are concerned because the land management zones are entirely above the 65th parallel where litte exploratory work is being done. We are concerned that the mining engineer will have jurisdiction over all the land. What competence has he? We would hope to have the multiple use concept recognized if the regulations were passed immediately in the light of what we know about boreal ecology. I should like to see all the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory covered by the legislation. I should also like to see a performance bond for each

• (4:10 p.m.)

In conclusion, I wish to make a cyclical reference to my introductory concern about the native people, the Indians, Eskimos and the Métis who make up 45 per cent of the population, but only 4 per cent of whom are employed in the Yukon. I would hope we would do everything possible to see that the rights of the native people are assured and that there is compensation for those people who live in the historical lands which have been violated. I would also hope we would exercise every possible concern for orderly development in respect of the vital and sensitive ecology.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments in respect of this bill. I assure members of the House that I do not do so on the basis of having all the answers about the north or that I have become an expert on the subject. A few days ago the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) admitted quite bluntly that during the negotiations for the sale of Home Oil, he was constantly skating on thin ice because of the absence of a government policy on the whole question of foreign investment in Canada. I suggest the same sort of thing applies to the present bill. It is another example of the government moving or trying to move in this delicate area without first having adopted, or perhaps even considered, any integrated policy in respect of foreign investment or even northern development. It is another example of the piecemeal type of operation we have so often criticized in the past. Not only is there no integrated investment or development policy, because these are aspects of the same thing, but neither is there a policy in