

National Parks Act

and has the government competent foresters who understand the management of timber and are employed within the jurisdiction of the parks?

Mr. Lesage: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have competent foresters and this is only to put the act in line with the situation that exists. There are foresters in the park who are experienced and who belong to the forestry branch of the department.

Mr. Harkness: I would like to ask the minister a question. What is the significance of the words in the first subparagraph of section 3:

The granting of leases . . . beginning on the first day of April and ending on the 31st day of October.

Does that mean that this section is applicable only to people who take up summer residence in the parks? In other words it is not applicable, we will say, to cases like Banff national park where there are people all the year round?

Mr. Lesage: This second part of paragraph (g) applies to lots in other subdivisions and not in town sites. So it does not apply to Banff town site.

Mr. Harkness: It does not apply, then, to any lease granted for year-round residence? I just took Banff as an example. Does it apply only to summer residence?

Mr. Lesage: Summer residence is covered by the same subsection. If my hon. friend would carefully read subsection (g) he will see there:

The granting of leases of lots in town sites for the purposes of residence, trade, schools, churches, hospitals and places of entertainment,

That is all the year round, and it continues:—and of lots in other subdivisions for the purposes of residence during the period beginning on the first day of April and ending on the 31st day of October.

Mr. Harkness: The point still remains. What about any residence which is on a year-round basis? I am thinking particularly of people who may have places where they build small cabins which are used in summer and also used for skiing in winter, and which would not be in a town site?

Mr. Lesage: Winter occupation could be under licence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Harkness: There is no provision for that sort of thing as far as this section is concerned, and really no provision for it otherwise.

Mr. Lesage: Subsection (h) gives the minister power to issue licences in general under the act.

[Mr. Herridge.]

Mr. Harkness: But a man may have a permit to build a cabin or a small house, and he has no lease or anything else. In other words he is in the position where a licence may be repealed at any moment.

Mr. Lesage: No, he can have a licence up to 21 years.

Mr. Harkness: In other words, a licence is the same thing as a lease?

Mr. Lesage: The difference between a licence and a lease is that a lease grants exclusive possession while a licence does not. Somebody can pass over a property which is not in anyone's exclusive possession.

Mr. Harkness: I would urge the minister to look into that matter, because people who may be in that situation, or may subsequently get into that situation, are in little better position than they would be in the case of a licence. At the present time there are a certain number of these cases. In future there may be a much larger number of cases, particularly if these parks develop, as I trust and hope they will, into very large skiing resorts.

Mr. Quelch: I want to ask the minister a question relating to lake Louise hotel. I am not referring to the fence we have heard criticized so much, although I think this is regrettable because the hotel had been up for many years without any fence being around the property, and then all of a sudden they decide to build a fence and it has caused a great deal of criticism. No doubt the reason given was that tourists were leaving a lot of wastepaper, etc., around the grounds, but I asked the superintendent of the park at Banff whether park officials had had any difficulty in that regard where there are public grounds and where tourists wander in crowds, and he said they had had no difficulty. There may be some reason in the case of the hotel but is it necessary to build a fence around the property?

I am wondering how far the lease goes. Does it go right down to the edge of the lake, because not only have they put a fence right around the property but they have also fenced the pathway down around the lake, and have put up a gate and a sign stating "Private Property—No Admittance". I was there in the fall and a lot of people were reluctant to use the walk around the lake because they were afraid they might be trespassing on private property. Surely it is not the intention of the government to fence people off from the lake entirely!

Mr. Lesage: I already said, I believe, that according to my information that fence does not exclude the public from the lake shore.