

berlist, also appeared before the committee and spoke in the following terms:

Norman Chamberlist told the Committee they were sitting in an area "where 70 years of frustration and the worst type of colonial status" had existed. "Even in the crown colony of Hong Kong they have the power to administer their own affairs" he said.

And then in a further paragraph in the report in the *Whitehorse Star*, we find this:

The councillor, recently re-elected for Whitehorse East, said the changes which appear to have been made in council set-up are really not improvements at all. Putting two elected members on the executive committee doesn't go far enough and is "just the icing on the cake" he said. He charged that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was building "a government within a government" to control more than 50 per cent of the land area of Canada.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the point the hon. member is making is very interesting, but he is making it at the wrong time. Last fall we had legislation concerning the administration of the Yukon and the changes were discussed and debated in the House. They were approved by the House. Now, we are discussing a mineral bill which really does not concern the administration of the Yukon Territory. I believe the hon. member should confine his remarks to the bill itself, because we wish to have his enlightened views in respect of this bill and not in respect of the bill that was passed last year.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the minister, may I say I think perhaps he has overlooked the fact that the changes in the Yukon Act which passed through the House recently had to do with the transfer of certain areas of jurisdiction to the territorial administration. Unlike most areas in Canada, the Yukon has a two-headed, jurisdictional monster, one head of which is the responsibility of the federal government in respect of the bill under discussion and another head in respect of which the jurisdictional responsibility has been transferred to the territorial administration to which the minister is referring. Therefore, I believe the hon. member who has the floor is perfectly in order in referring to these federal aspects of the administration of the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker: The point raised by the minister is one of interest. The argument by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) appears to be reasonable, but it is difficult for the Chair, without looking into all the details of the act much more closely, to determine whether the hon. member who now has the floor is going beyond the limit of the bill itself. That hon. member, who is one of the senior members of the House, knows the rules much better than the Speaker, and he realizes that he must limit his contribution in the debate to what is before the House, which is the second reading of the bill. I might add that he knows much better than the Speaker what is in the bill, and I am sure he would not want to take advantage of the situation to discuss at this time matters which do not fall within the scope of the bill which is now under consideration.

Yukon Minerals Act

Mr. Dinsdale: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for those enlightening words. Perhaps because of all the noise which prevailed when the debate began today, the minister did not catch my point. I am emphasizing the fundamental problem that arises in connection with legislating for the Yukon Territory. The minister makes the point that it is the responsibility of the federal government. This is the reason we have such a strong protest from the people of the Yukon. They want to have move of this responsibility in their hands. I was quoting from responsible leaders of the Yukon who underlined this point. Now, I should like to quote from the minister himself. I refer to a press release of February 27, 1971 from his department. The following appears on page two of that release:

Regarding the Yukon Minerals Act, Mr. Chrétien said that recent discussions in Whitehorse by officials of his department and representatives of the mining industry and the Yukon Legislative Council had resulted in a very meaningful exchange of ideas.

The phrase "a meaningful exchange of ideas" means that there was a good deal of heated controversy. In the world of semantics, that is the interpretation which one can always make at. The press release continues:

He also said that he had been persuaded that further consideration should be given to some modification of the deductions allowable for royalty purposes. "While I know the reasons for concern about the Canadian participation provisions," the Minister said, "I feel that activity in oil and gas exploration in the North and in mining in the Northwest Territories, where similar provisions apply, indicates that the concerns are over emphasized."

• (12:10 p.m.)

Obviously, there is real static arising from the territory. I know, as a former minister, that this is the case when Ottawa arbitrarily intrudes into areas of responsibilities that should, at this late date, devolve upon the local people. The minister referred to "efficient local management". That is the first point I want to make, the necessity of consultation. The minister, I am sure, is aware of that point.

I should now like to deal briefly with another major issue, that is the application of the Canadian mining regulations to the Yukon territory. These were introduced to the Northwest Territories in 1961 and provide, as hon. members know, for Canadian participation in companies incorporated in Canada, and the listing of shares on the Canadian stock exchange at the production stage of resource development. There is no application of these regulations at the exploration or the lease stage of resource location and exploration.

The reason that these regulations were not applied to the Yukon territory in 1961 is precisely that there was no local agreement from the Yukon chamber of mines nor from the Yukon Territorial Council for the very good reason that they had an established industry. They had these traditions and they had a record of efficient management of resources over half a century. The minister himself acknowledged this when he used the phrase "the mining industry which is already flourishing in the Yukon". If it is already flourishing, why aggravate the situation, as the proposed new bill does? It is true that