

*Yukon Minerals Act*

hunting and trapping economy to zero. "On the other hand," he writes, "rigid regulatory control of land-use operations could maintain the value of the habitat at the full \$1,400,000."

The article is rather lengthy, so I will not continue with it but it indicates the kind of cost-benefit concern we have to highlight. This is exactly what the amendment proposed a few moments ago was attempting to get at. The Naysmith editorial dealt only with oil and gas exploration, but we know there are other groups of companies involved in other kinds of exploration—minerals, for examples. We know also that there are native people in northern Canada, other than the Old Crow Indians, used in my example who are affected.

The statement in the editorial is indicative of what can happen to one group of people. It is but an example. We can read more into it than that if we remember that nearly 50 per cent of the people living in northern Canada are native people.

If one did not learn from reading the bill, a tip-off as to who is really calling the shots on northern development could be obtained from a press release from the minister's office datelined Whitehorse, February 27, 1971. I quote from page 1 of the press release:

Proposed Land-Use Regulations—

By the way, we have not seen these land-use regulations.

**Mr. Nielsen:** We have.

**Mr. Rose:** I have not seen these land-use regulations.

• (3:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Nielsen:** Which version?

**Mr. Rose:** I had intended to make that point later. Will these land use regulations be made public by press release or will they be tabled in the House of Commons?

**Mr. Nielsen:** The press release version, I expect.

**Mr. Rose:** There will probably be many versions before we are through. It should not be forgotten that the success of this bill depends to a great extent on the nature of these land use regulations. If the regulations are amorphous or ambiguous, the situation is all the more frightening. Anyway, before I was assisted by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), I was about to quote from the minister's press release. The hon. gentleman says that regulations for the Yukon have caused concern in the territory. He does not tell us where this concern originated. He added that these regulations were still subject to discussion between government representatives, the mining industry and some of the other interested people. I hope "some of the other interested people" are natives. That is what the minister said on February 27. The communique went on to state:

The minister gave this assurance following representations made last week by the mining industry which feels that the regulations in their present form would inhibit development of the Yukon.

**An hon. Member:** Isn't that awful?

[Mr. Rose.]

**Mr. Rose:** That is interesting, because there is likely to be a polarity of opinion, a dichotomy of view as between those who owe allegiance to shareholders and those who are concerned about the ecology of the north and the wellbeing of the native people. We would like to know on whose side the minister is. The communique continues:

The minister said he wanted to assure the people of the Yukon and the Yukon Chamber of Mines that there would be adequate provision for appeal—

So, these people will be able to appeal. Will there be adequate provision for appeal by the native people when their traplines are desecrated and their herds made extinct? That is what we should like to know. This is the most important issue before us now. It is obvious the mining companies have "got to" the minister, those who want to go to the north, make a profit, and get out as fast as possible. Are only they to be given adequate opportunity for appeal?

—where discretionary powers were exercised in a quasi-judicial manner; the need for other discretionary powers would be carefully reviewed and regulations pursuant to the act would be introduced only after thorough discussion and after adequate notice had been given to the mining industry and the general public of the Yukon.

That press release was sent out in February, and it is relatively old. In any event, it is not particularly reassuring. I think we should understand perfectly clearly who it is the minister wants to reassure. Is it the Indians? Is it the Eskimo who have lived for centuries in the north? Is it the tourist camp operators who look upon the north, its flora and wildlife as worth preserving? Or is the minister thinking of those who consider the north only as a storehouse, as a resource package to be exploited? I submit that those the minister wants to reassure are the mining and exploration companies and their satellites, the businessmen, the subcontractors, the whites who want to go into the north, make a killing and get out as fast as possible. An examination of the cemeteries of the north would reveal that most whites go south to die.

**Mr. Chrétien:** It is no longer so. You have not been there for a long time, if ever. That is evident.

**Mr. Rose:** I have not been there since the minister has been to Texas.

These are the people the minister wants to reassure. They are a powerful and well-financed lobby and I think they will do their best to destroy even the puny environmental regulations for which provision is made in the bill. This is what frightens us. If we can mount as powerful and persuasive a lobby from this side of the House, so much the better.

A few weeks ago the CBC aired an excellent documentary on the north. It was called "A White Paper on the North" and in my opinion it should be required viewing in every school and college in Canada. I say this because unless we wake up very soon, the north will be dominated by the explorers and the exploiters whose depredations—and this is the view of many well-informed people—will destroy a part of Canada which is so sensitive as to be incapable of ecological regeneration within a reasonable time.