

National Parks Act

are being filled with billboards advertising liquor, automobiles and cigarettes. Who decided the policy which permitted this, and when was it decided? I am sure that no Member of Parliament really knew what was going on when this decision was made. The same thing might happen in the national parks if they are put under a Crown corporation.

I would like to again emphasize the point I made about billboards blossoming within our airports, because it seems to me that if this bill passes in its present form the Crown corporation responsible for the national parks would allow billboards to be put up in the parks. I can assure you that the people of this nation will not take kindly to any government or Crown corporation allowing hot dog stands and billboards to be erected throughout our countryside.

Another point I would like to make concerns the creation of the latest national park mentioned by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), namely, the Gaspé National Park. I realize that the province of Quebec needs this park. However, the point we are all missing is that it is a 99-year proposition. This gets away from the idea of national parks from coast to coast being part of a national identity, because at the end of 99 years the province of Quebec—if it happened to be in the province of Saskatchewan, the same thing could apply—the province could pay back the federal government and take over the park and the entire concept of national identity and national parks will have gone down the drain. I object most strenuously to this type of legislation being allowed to pass in this House when we consider the entire concept of national park.

● (9:10 p.m.)

We know that too many provinces and too many corporations will use some sort of drawing power to bring people to an area. We suggest that whenever a national park is being established strictly for the benefit of drawing power and commercialism—and what comes with commercialism everybody in this House knows—it is a wrong concept and a wrong method of doing things.

If we wish to retain our identity and have truly national parks it is high time we did exactly that and kept these national parks in perpetuity. This is the only way they could possibly exist under these conditions. In the town of Jasper, as was mentioned by the previous speaker, the hon. member for Red Deer, there are many people now employed in

the railway industry and many other service industries. Surely Banff and Jasper in particular should be given self-government.

I am sure that the remarks made by my colleague from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) are very apt and absolutely true as you look at the situation that now exists. He said that people living in Banff and Jasper—and he said it many years ago—should not be the prisoners of their environment. No one in this House would like to see anyone a prisoner of his environment and recognized as a second-class citizen. Unless we recognize that Banff and Jasper in particular have a say in this over-all proposal, and have some means of communication, we are telling them that many people are not first-class citizens.

The officers of our national parks are to be commended for their diligence in trying to preserve a parks identity in this nation. I think it is only right that we give them due credit for that. Too often we hear criticism along the lines that they are not doing a good job, but the officers of these national parks are endeavouring to carry out a policy with which many of us in this House agree. If we are now to suggest that we turn the parks over to a Crown corporation—as members have said, a faceless corporation that does not have the proper feeling and the heart—we are doing a disservice to everybody concerned. I would urge that no consideration be given to establishing a Crown corporation in this particular field. Crown corporations have served and do serve many useful purposes in many fields, but this is a human relations field, it is a social science field, and it is one place where we do not want or need a Crown corporation.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this debate I would first of all say that the constituency of Crowfoot runs very close to the national park at Banff. I have a particular attachment to the national park at Banff because my brother was the member of this House who for nine years represented the old riding of Jasper-Edson. I can assure the House that I listened to him many times, after this House had shut down, when he spoke of the problems of Jasper park and the bureaucratic set-up that was administering the national parks at both Banff and Jasper. So I take part in this debate with indeed an interest in the affairs of the two major parks in the province of Alberta, and also with concern for the growing interest in the playgrounds and recreational facilities at Waterton. These contribute