

*National Parks Act*

communities are being manipulated entirely by and for the appointed administrators and the ideas they see best applying to them.

The impression has evidently been widely held that these communities are largely populated by vultures preying on the innocent tourist, whose park residence has constituted if not a licence to steal, then at least a licence to coin money. The government and the administrators have known that this has not been true. The information advanced during this debate by the hon. members for Rocky Mountain and Red Deer refutes that impression utterly. I will not repeat it, but I hope that it will be remembered by every member of this House as he considers this and future parks legislation.

It may be suggested that the rights of these people are adequately protected by this chamber and that the valiant efforts of the hon. member for Rocky Mountain will suffice. I should like to read into the record a brief extract from the Durham report. I will read from page 287 of Volume II of the 1912 Oxford edition, edited by Sir C. P. Lucas. This is from the text of the report and he was speaking here of the provinces of Canada from 1837 to 1839. The report reads:

The establishment of a good system of municipal institutions throughout these Provinces is a matter of vital importance. A general legislature, which manages the private business of every parish, in addition to the common business of the country, wields a power which no single body, however popular in its constitution, ought to have; a power which must be destructive of any constitutional balance.

A little later on he says:

The establishment of municipal institutions for the whole country should be made a part of every colonial constitution; and the prerogative of the Crown should be constantly interposed to check any encroachment on the functions of the local bodies, until the people should become alive, as most assuredly they almost immediately would be, to the necessity of protecting their local privileges.

I suggest it is high time that the residents of these park towns were given the same rights of municipal government the rest of us enjoy.

Regrettably, with the handful of exceptions I have already mentioned, members of the official opposition participating in this debate have chosen to ignore the central issue and to misrepresent the effect of the main provisions of the legislation. They have emphasized an irrelevant matter in an effort to create a phony issue. Again, there are a couple of other exceptions. Their contributions consist-

[Mr. Mahoney.]

ed of innocuous little homilies for home consumption and they neglected to face up to the substance of the bill.

I followed the debate on this bill with considerable interest and some dismay at some of the gross irrelevancies that have marred it from the time the second member spoke. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), leading for the official opposition in his capacity as its shadow minister of Indian affairs and northern development, chose to give little attention to the substance of the bill, but rather devoted the bulk of his wit, wisdom and talent to a totally unsuccessful attempt to create yet another non-issue out of the fact that the minister had chosen to delegate the responsibility for piloting this bill through second reading to his capable Parliamentary Secretary.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was inspired to participate in the debate by saying that the selection of the Parliamentary Secretary for this important task was yet another example, to quote him from page 3691 of *Hansard*, of "egregious contempt that is being shown to Parliament by the present administration". Well, "egregious" is not one of my six bit words, but obfuscation is, and that is what the hon. member for Oxford's efforts, compounded by those of the right hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and the hon. member for Edmonton West, earlier today, amounted to—obfuscation.

It is somewhat pathetic to observe the frontbenchers opposite grasp at every procedural straw in a nostalgic effort to recreate the good old days of the pipeline debate.

● (4:40 p.m.)

This is 1970 not 1956, Mr. Speaker. Without commenting on the merits of the issues that came out of the pipeline debate, the public bought them and the public is usually right. However, the public paid quite a price—six years of the worst government Canada has ever enjoyed—and the public is not about to be fooled into buying a phony non-issue, no matter how well or badly it is dramatized here.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Were you in favour of the bill?

**Mr. Mahoney:** Hon. members opposite and members of the press are fond of noting occasions when a backbencher here takes issue with some aspect or other of a government