

*Adjournment Motion*

Saint John has been awarded a contract worth \$39.4 million regarding the Canadian patrol frigate contract definition phase of the program. There is a \$2.6 billion contract for the construction of six new frigates which is being bid on by Saint John and its competitor Scan Marine. This contract alone has the potential of providing 30,000 person-years of employment or over 7,000 person-years of shipyard labour over a ten-year period.

There is room for improvement, but I would refer the Hon. Member to the Minister's comment that in the very near future we will have an announcement to make on this very important topic.

NATIONAL PARKS—BANFF LAND EXCHANGE—REQUEST THAT HOUSING PERMIT BE CANCELLED. (B) REQUEST FOR MINISTER'S RESIGNATION

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Mr. Speaker, tonight we will discuss the desecration of a beautiful park in Banff, a desecration which was requested by Parks Canada, says the Minister.

● (2220)

The facts of the case are as follows. First, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts), in charge of National Parks, issued a permit for the construction of a 76-unit complex in the only treed park in the townsite of Banff which is located in Banff National Park. The Minister alleged that Parks Canada issued the permit and pretended that he had nothing to do with it. But, in a representative democracy under our form of Government, the Minister must take responsibility for the actions of his Department. If indeed the Minister had nothing to do with the issuance of the permit, why did he not freeze the project and fully investigate the entire matter when it was raised in the House? That is what any other government or any responsible government would have done.

Second, the Minister and/or Parks Canada did not notify the people of the area that a 76-unit complex was to be built in their park. In any town or village, even the smallest village in Alberta, before authorizing a public work in any area the council notifies the people of the area. They are given an opportunity to comment. They are told that an apartment building or whatever is being planned, and they are asked for comment. Parks Canada did not do this. The Minister well knows that this was kept secret for a period of months, and that the only way the people found out was from a leak published in the *Crag and Canyon*. Then the people knew, but not until then.

Third, the Minister justified the swap of land by saying that Banff needs affordable accommodation. Banff needs affordable accommodation for the workers in Banff, but the Minister secured no guarantee that accommodation in the 76-unit complex would be affordable. Now the people of the area have been advised by the company that the accommodation will be as affordable as possible, and rates like \$500 to \$800 are being suggested. Rates like \$500, \$600 or \$800 per month will not be good enough. Such rates are not affordable for people who make only \$800 to \$1,200 per month. But the Minister secured

no guarantee in regard to the rates, and now the company will charge all the market will bear.

Fourth, the land swap or the park was valued by Parks Canada at \$1,368,000 for five lots which I consider to be worth about \$600,000. The Minister claims they are worth \$900,000. Taking the Minister's own figure, this leaves a difference of over \$400,000 in favour of Buchanan and company. In other words, the Buchanan and company lots could accommodate at the very best 20 units, while the land given to the company by Parks Canada will accommodate 76 units. Is there any company in Canada that would not jump at an offer like that? What is more, the whole deal was done by negotiations, with no public tender and no auction.

Fifth, the Minister did not refer the deal to the Treasury Board. The Minister apparently was taken aback by the refusal of Treasury Board in December 1981, and was not taking any more chances in getting another refusal, particularly for a deal which the Minister alleges he knew nothing about.

Sixth, the Minister did not refer the project to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, FEARO.

In conclusion, as I said to the Minister in Committee the other day, the deal was done under the table and he knows it. The Minister did not answer. As the development officer of Parks Canada in Banff said after he resigned, "The deal smells to high heaven". I beseech the Minister to save the park, call off the company, listen to the views of people expressed in the press from all parts of Canada, and build the project some other place in Banff; save the park.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) is a first-rate hockey player. Again tonight we have seen an example of the Opposition skating around the true issues which underlie the matter before us.

There have been many allegations in the House over the past few days regarding the land exchange in Banff National Park. Much of the information given by Hon. Members opposite has been mistaken, and questions have often been phrased in a manner of insinuation rather than on a clear, factual foundation. I should like to cite a number of examples of what I have just claimed.

First, the Hon. Member said that we should not have allowed a beautiful park to have been destroyed. What is this park? This is an area which has been zoned R3. This has been a matter of public record since 1972. It was publicized in 1972 and again in 1980. Therefore, this development can really be considered as being a fulfilment of the zoning purpose for that property.

● (2225)

There is another misconception, the second one. The Hon. Member stated that the swap, the exchanged property, should have been subject to public tender. In this particular instance a public tender would not have been possible since a land