

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): He must bring the men before the magistrate in the park; but of course my hon. friend will raise the objection that the magistrate is an appointee of the federal government.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What is the difference between a provincial constable bringing a suspect before a provincial magistrate and a federal constable bringing him before a federally appointed magistrate?

Mr. STEVENS: Nothing except this—and this is the point—that there may grow up in a community of that character an insular, petty condition of mind which often obtains in communities of an insular character, particularly where, as in the case of Jasper or Banff, the community is quite a substantial one.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We appoint paid magistrates purely for that purpose. I think in the old days my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) who has just left the house, had the appointment of two of them. That was under the old police act. When it was changed, the right to appoint by the federal authority was discontinued. Then we reverted to appointments by the province, but the selections were made by the federal government and the police magistrates are paid by the federal government. I confess I cannot see any difference between a provincial constable haling a person suspected of crime before a provincially appointed magistrate and a federal officer haling such a person before a federally appointed magistrate. I cannot help thinking we are very largely tilting at windmills. This administration has been carried on under both parties and I have heard most bitter complaints about the treatment that citizens have received. Some times I have gone to the trouble of investigating these complaints myself, and for the most part they are of the same character as those of which you hear in any municipality in the country.

Mr. STEVENS: Usually piffing.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I quite appreciate the fact, and I am in accord with the suggestion of my hon. friend that there should be thirty days' publication of any change in the regulations so that the citizens, and, particularly, the tourists, may be informed about it. We try to post up in conspicuous places regulations affecting traffic in order that tourists who are not familiar with our regulations may become informed, because unless they are familiar with the regulations

tourists constitute a terrible menace on the narrow mountain roads. In administering these park areas we have a good deal of difficulty in protecting the game and also the lives of the people who visit them for the purpose of seeing the game. We must also have drastic regulations for the prevention of fire, because that is the most destructive element with which we have to contend. At first view some of these provisions may appear drastic, but after all if they are judiciously administered they are all in the interest of the people who visit the parks, and particularly the people who live within their boundaries.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to suggest to the minister that the wording in the old act is far better than the new clause 4. The old section reads that these parks—

—shall be maintained and made use of as public parks and pleasure grounds for the benefit, advantage and enjoyment of the people of Canada.

It seems to me that is much plainer and more understandable than the high sounding language used in the new clause 4. What does it mean by saying?

The parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment.

It would be much better to say that they are to be maintained for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: It is evidence of piety.

Mr. COOTE: I would also like to say just in passing I do not think it is possible for us to control the actions of future generations. Just how we are going to administer and take care of these parks and leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, it is rather difficult to see.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Does my hon. friend think there is any very great difference between the old section and the new? In both it is a pious hope. I would not care very much if you wiped both of them out. I do not think either section will do much harm or much good to the national parks.

Mr. COOTE: It seems to me that we are just making a pretence of doing something here, and I never think that that is good practice.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If my hon. friend says that we are not making an effort to preserve these areas for scenic purposes he is wrong.