

National Parks Act

Mr. Diefenbaker: Surely.

Mr. Honey: Would the right hon. gentleman agree with me that it was his government which, between 1958 and 1962, ended leases in national parks in perpetuity and limited the longest term to 45 years or 42 years?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that has been answered over and over again by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). These myths may satisfy the hon. gentleman, but they do not represent the facts.

Mr. Dinsdale: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that I was in the House to hear an outstanding legal presentation of this matter. My friend, the parliamentary secretary continues to deal in—

An hon. Member: Lies.

Mr. Dinsdale: —innuendo, insinuation and terminological inexactitudes. Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled in this regard to indicate precisely what the situation is. I will have to do it by being fairly specific on the matter. The information should be in the hands of the parliamentary secretary. He is purporting to conduct this legislation through the House and the information is available from the department responsible for these matters. In 1958, a moratorium was declared on any further alienation of national park land until such time as the development policy could be reviewed in each of the western parks and plans to meet the high standards of national park development presented to the people of the parks themselves, so that they might decide and comment on any proposals.

The question of perpetuity of existing leases when they came up for assignment or renewal became a matter of controversy in 1962. At that time, it was decided that there would be no interference on assignment with the government guarantee of perpetuity. Furthermore, it was decided that the question of perpetuity on lease renewals would not be dealt with at this time. Rather, renewals were for 42 years plus 21 years open-ended. By that time, the whole matter would be reviewed and this fundamental principle guaranteed by the Canadian government would have come under consideration. The policy which cancelled perpetuity came in 1963, after the change of government.

Mr. Laing: We have the order in council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am prepared to recognize the parliamentary secretary but

I would like to voice one misgiving here. I recognized the right of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) to clarify a point on which he feels there has been misrepresentation. On the other hand, I am concerned that we are now approaching debate on the matter and as the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) suggests, I am trying to allow the record to be corrected without getting into debate. In this regard I would seek the co-operation of members.

Is the parliamentary secretary rising—

Mr. Honey: On the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), Mr. Speaker. If I had the leave of the House, perhaps I could table two orders in council.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not a question of privilege.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Honey: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if my right hon. friend wishes me to, perhaps I might refer to the Orders in Council. The first Order in Council is SOR/58-330 and is dated August 7, 1958.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I say that I do not object when the hon. member tries to fill in the record, but his remarks have nothing to do with any question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am inclined to agree. I must say I am having misgivings about the original question of privilege. I am trying to be as fair as possible to both sides of the position. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary would like to seek leave—

An hon. Member: Let us have the proof

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the parliamentary secretary originally wanted leave of the House to table the two Orders in Council. Perhaps that would be our simplest procedure, if there is consent.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The parliamentary secretary will speak when he closes the debate. He will then have an opportunity to make a full reply to questions asked and to make a statement.

Mr. Bell: Bring the minister in and let him make a statement.

Mr. Honey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since there is no unanimous consent for the tabling of the Orders in Council, perhaps I could refer to them briefly.