

*National Parks Act*

consideration and consultation is necessary or else the provinces will sit on their high horse and say: We alone are the protectors of civil liberties. Sometimes it looks as though this is true; it is a pity if it is.

I rarely criticize in this House unless I have a practical solution of some kind to offer. I do not advocate a simple hands-off policy. I do not say we had all the answers long ago and that nothing should be done to change the situation. Indeed, I believe it is time to follow a definite policy in connection with the zoning of our parks. Such a policy is necessary if we are to avoid confusion, injustice and political interference. I believe we must set aside the townsites in some way by agreement with the provinces—turn them back to the full jurisdiction of the provinces. It may well be provision should be made for a corridor through the parks for the sake of better transportation; the railroads did it before the parks were even opened up. We might well have to take the original act and revise it. In this regard, Bill C-152 is perhaps long overdue. But I do not want to see the parks get into the hands of greedy and ambitious people who trot out the whooping crane or the disappearing bison as excuses for denying the people of Canada proper access, or who, on the other hand limit the proper conservation of our wild life and natural beauty on the grounds that there might otherwise be certain injustices.

As to leases, I say that when it comes to paying compensation, or changing the terms of leases, let there be no star chamber tactics. The people of Jasper Park have told me they are quite willing to give up their leases any time it can be shown to them in fair discussion that their particular properties are needed for higher good. And by this, being the well-adjusted citizens they are, they mean that their property would be used by more people to greater advantage while still preserving the wild life and beauty to which I am sure we are all dedicated. This is an attitude on their part which I think has been overlooked. I have no hesitation in saying that these are the people to whom we should look for advice. They are not cold statisticians. Over the last 40 to 50 years they have shown the people of Canada and the world the type of hospitality which has given Alberta and western Canada a name which is a byword in the tourist industry.

As I say, there may be regional differences in what is required, but the general policy applied should be uniform. The Prince Albert

[Mr. Bigg.]

National Park, created some years later than those in Alberta, has avoided some of the difficulties I have been discussing. Nevertheless, I understand there is a move on foot at the present time to expropriate owners there as well. I should like to know, and they would like to know—since these services must be provided by somebody—why it is that one person owning a motel should be expropriated to allow another person, arbitrarily chosen behind closed doors, to take over a perfectly legitimate way of earning a living. Why should land and property be removed without cause and given to somebody else?

Another point I wish to make is this: we should develop a national policy with regard to the parks and with regard, also, to the treatment of individuals. Why should leases be granted in one province for 99 years, in another for 42 years and in a third for 21 years? Why cannot the period be the same? I do not think we are likely to get away from this type of disparity by simply handing the whole question over to a Crown corporation which may or may not be in full possession of the facts. And if the corporation does happen to be in full possession of the facts, what guarantee is there that it will be in a better position to ensure equality of treatment across Canada than, say, a committee of this House?

Many other hon. members wish to speak in this debate. We want to hear from all the different areas in Canada. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if this national parks policy is discussed openly, if we talk to the people of Banff, Jasper, Glacier Park and Wood Buffalo Park with the same frankness as they are willing to show, there need be no worries about constitutional difficulties or political infighting. These people are concerned primarily to earn an honest living by giving a service to the people of Canada. If anything can be learned from the record of the past, we can be sure that the future of our national parks will remain in good hands.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, this new bill on national parks could at long last facilitate the creation of this type of parks within the boundaries of Quebec.

The difficulties encouraged in drawing up the plans for the Forillon Park in the Gaspé Peninsula would have been lessened had this legislation already been adopted, and provided the minister does not intend secretly to modify the ultimate objective of those parks, I cannot but approve Bill C-152.