

National Parks Act

outlined briefly tonight was headed, "Bravo, Mr. Dinsdale!". The editorial wholly endorsed the plan which was laid down at that time. There was a similar editorial in the *Calgary Herald*. Both these editorials arose from the fact that the announcement was made in the province of Alberta which perhaps has the largest land area devoted to national parks.

The situation has deteriorated sadly since that time. The government has arbitrarily cancelled perpetual leases. A parliamentary committee went to the mountain parks three or four years ago and for three days listened to the voice of the people there. I thought they made a convincing case, but the government decided otherwise and came up with this leasehold Crown corporation as a solution to a problem that was becoming embarrassing to the government. Incidentally, this is not a new act. It was first proposed in 1967, as I recall, before the last election. Because it was politically embarrassing, the government decided not to proceed with it. As a result of the administrative decree which had arbitrarily removed fundamental rights of the people—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired. He will be allowed to continue only with unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Sulatycky: Could I ask the hon. member another question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the House give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sulatycky: Is the hon. member for Brandon-Souris aware of the recommendation of the Glassco Commission, that the commissioners of the national parks be part of an autonomous commission? This proposal stemmed from that. This was in 1962, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dinsdale: I am aware of the voice of the people of the Rocky Mountain constituency which is opposed to what the government is now suggesting. Surely, the voice of the people of Canada should take priority over the task forces, the commissions, royal commissions, Information Canada and all the other administrative bodies which have no authority or responsibility to the people of Canada. Surely, the voice of the people is much more important than these faceless bodies.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Because of the arbitrary administrative decree which removed a fundamental right of the people of the parks which had been granted by the Crown, the people took the matter to the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court upheld the rights of the people. Now the minister, great democrat that he is, has taken this question to the Supreme Court of Canada to try to have the opinion reversed. The latest controversy revolves around the exorbitant increase in leasehold rentals to which I have already made reference. My friend the parliamentary secretary disputes the figures. Unfortunately, I do not have time to go into a detailed analysis; but as was pointed out in the letter which I read, the residents of the park are quite happy with the provincial assessment rates as the basis. They are the ones affected by the exorbitant figures to which I have already referred.

The protests of the people of the national parks is a western protest. Surely, the government is not so insensitive to the problem of national unity in this country that it refuses to regard this as a special regional problem in the west. An article in the *January 16, 1970*, edition of the *Calgary Herald* is headed, "Chrétien tells Banff 'Like it or Leave'." There is real, responsible democracy for you!

My time is rapidly coming to an end. I want to indicate that there is a need for change and reform with respect to the administration of the western national parks. I think the other provinces should come into the national parks system. We need a rapid increase in the number of national parks available. We need recreational parks. There was a program all set to roll which would have provided financial assistance to the provinces to expand their recreational parks network.

• (9:00 p.m.)

In addition, in the light of the unhappy experience in our western national parks, we need to reinforce the zoning principles laid down in 1963 so that there could be a special category of parks which might well be called national wilderness parks. The zoning principle was designed to prevent any further deterioration of the wilderness in the western parks. Westerners, above all others, realize the importance of preserving this aspect of our national resources. The boundaries of wilderness parks and the zoning in national parks have to be established by legislation because, obviously, the government cannot be