

*Supply—Indian Affairs*

be done about the problem other than talking about it.

We are fully aware of the situation in our national parks. We have never had a uniform policy with regard to the development and management of the national parks across the country. The approach to the parks in the maritimes is somewhat different from the approach in the western provinces. This matter has historical overtones, of course. We were able to establish national parks in the western provinces when the resources were still under the control of the federal government prior to 1930, when the control of these resources was transferred back to the provinces. Therefore we have comparatively large national park facilities in the western provinces.

• (12:20 p.m.)

On the other hand there are no national parks in the province of Quebec; therefore they do not have any of the current problems that those of us from western Canada constantly face in the administration of national parks. There are very few national parks in the province of Ontario. In fact they are not really national parks, they are small areas which in no way carry out the purpose and function of the National Parks Act.

Perhaps this is why such newspapers as the *Globe and Mail* can intone piously and advise us concerning the peculiar problems in our western provinces, as it did in an editorial on Thursday, March 23 of this year, entitled "A Heritage Preserved". This editorial takes a very dim view of the viewpoint expressed by the residents of Banff and Jasper. I think it would be much better for a Toronto newspaper to encourage the government of Ontario to make land available so we could expand our national park system in this province than to turn its jaundiced eye westward and advise westerners on how they might deal with their peculiar problems.

I will not go into the problem of the western parks in any detail. We will have more discussion in the house on that matter in the days that lie ahead. However, I would like to point out that during the course of the committee hearings at both Banff and Jasper we were impressed by the willingness and in fact the enthusiasm of the residents of those two parks to support the principles, the precepts and the policy of the wise management and multiple use of our renewable resources which have emerged in Canada during the past decade. They accept these principles. What they criticize and object to is the arbitrary manner in which the minister and the

government are trying, as the old preacher says to "unscrew the unscrutable", unravel problems that have been created by government decrees over the years.

Of course I am referring specifically to the arbitrary manner of dealing with the leasehold problem. In the western parks, because of the peculiar circumstances which I have outlined, when they were set up and when the federal government had control over the resources, comparatively large tracts of land were preserved for this purpose. Because the population was isolated and limited, settlement in the parks was encouraged, particularly in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

So far as Banff is concerned, it was a town-site before it was a park. It is a railroading town, as is Jasper, and without drawing any diagrams it is obvious that the fact that these towns are located right in the middle of the national park will create problems. The problems will have to be dealt with, and they will be resolved over the years.

However, I think the government is pursuing a very unwise policy in trying to arbitrarily superimpose an approach to leasehold privileges which these people have had over the years and which have been established by earlier government actions. It seems to be the intention of the government to arbitrarily cancel these leaseholds, if I understand correctly the report which came out of the proceedings of the committee which dealt with national park problems.

It is for this reason that the members of the Conservative party serving on that committee publicly dissociated themselves from the report. We will not go along with this bureaucratic approach to rights which have been established over the years by the government of Canada itself. We will not go along with the policy which ignores the peculiar problems of the parks in western Canada which have been created as a result of the historical circumstances I have outlined. Perhaps the reason the government members have so enthusiastically supported these arbitrary recommendations is that they come from other parts of Canada which are not faced with these difficulties. Ontario members have no problems because they have no national parks; neither do the Quebec members. This also applies to maritime members because right from the beginning their provinces have pretty well operated within the framework of the National Parks Act. So I make a plea here today.