

*Yukon and Territorial Lands Acts*

this situation, because it speaks of establishing land management zones. The criteria with respect to various activities in these land management zones will vary as between one zone and another. There is no over-all directive at the national level with respect to what the general criteria ought to be. This provision reflects the government's attitude, and that attitude is also reflected in the Canada Water Act legislation.

The bill talks of pollution control for the land, but disregards completely pollution control for air, taking no cognizance whatever of pollution coming from noise and the effect this can have upon the terrains ecological structure. We know that in an ecosystem as delicate as the one in the north, an adverse effect on one aspect of the environment has a much greater effect on other aspects of the environment than is the case in southern Canada. I submit that because the government seeks to deal with the matter of pollution on land but ignores pollution of the air, the bill will not be effective in controlling pollution.

• (4:30 p.m.)

On May 4 the minister spoke to the Canadian Transportation Research Forum in Winnipeg. The minister made reference to that speech this afternoon. If the minister will listen, I wish to ask him with respect to that speech where the land use regulations are that have been developed. There is no point coming before Parliament and asking for an alteration to the Territorial Lands Act which conceives of having land use regulations. The bill is so sparse in its information about this matter that the full force the minister hopes for will be contained in the regulations. It is unkind to Parliament for the minister to say that the full force of what is to be done will be in the regulations. The minister says, "I have the regulations developed. They are here, but I am not going to tell you what they are". I think it is incumbent upon the minister to disclose those regulations before he asks Parliament to give him a blanket type of endorsement. The minister shakes his head.

**Mr. Chrétien:** I point out to the hon. member—

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I hope the minister is doing this on a point of order, otherwise he will close the debate.

**Mr. Chrétien:** It is on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The way we proceed, there is legislation. It is only after that—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The minister cannot rise to elaborate a point by way of a point of order. He may do that when he closes the debate on second reading.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I know what the minister was getting at. If anything in Parliament is normal, the minister says the normal course of doing things is to pass the legislation which seeks to give the Governor in Council the right to make regulations. After Parliament does that, the government makes the regulations and says, "Here they are." I do not agree that is the way it should be done, particularly with such an important piece of legislation as this. This bill is not very full in the explanation of what it intends to do.

The full authority given to the Governor in Council to make regulations, and the full value of the minister's concern about environmental or pollution control with respect to land use will be contained in the regulations. The minister says he already has the regulations. Instead of keeping them secret, why does he not tell us what they are? I ask the minister, through Your Honour, why these regulations are being denied to us when they already exist. They have been prepared. This is what Parliament would like to know. I realize it is difficult for the minister to do this. I will gladly yield the floor on another point of order so he can explain why he has not provided us with the existing regulations which are the full force of the legislation.

**Mr. Lewis:** Or tell us what is in them.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** The minister chooses to remain silent and uncommunicative on this very important point.

**Mr. Lewis:** Perhaps he does not know what is in them.

**Mr. Chrétien:** I do not have the right to speak.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** He will close the debate.

**Mr. Chrétien:** I do not mind closing the debate.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Give the minister unanimous consent to reply.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** There is a chorus of Liberals complaining that the minister cannot get the floor. The minister had the floor. He had the first opportunity. He had unlimited time. Why did he not do it then? If the minis-