

National Parks Act

the federal government at Ottawa from the people that it governs in the national parks. It will further strengthen the impression of the people of western Canada that the national parks are ruled by Ottawa bureaucrats.

In general, I am against the use of Crown corporations. Certainly, in situations such as this there should not be a Crown corporation established. Its establishment can only increase the feeling of mistrust and alienation, something westerners bitterly resent, against Ottawa and this Montreal-oriented government.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I want to say at once that I am against this legislation. I have but a few points to make. First of all, like some members of my own party I, too, feel that the minister has been very conscientious.

There seems to be a misapprehension about our parks in this country, and I think the fact that there is a department within a department of government may have something to do with this. I ask the House to consider one salient point: Who created the western parks? Or, if you want to put it this way, who created the national parks, though we are talking here specifically about the western parks. The people of the west themselves created these parks. There was some local pressure, but these people appreciated the potential of the area and demanded that the Canadian government establish national parks. In those days the people had to ride horseback or go by buggy to the parks, and this trip took one or two days. This they did in order to emphasize to the federal government that these were areas that should be preserved.

In the interest of brevity, I will make but two further points. One relates to the facts and figures released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics relating to all western mountain parks. Visitors to the western parks from Ottawa, Toronto or the Maritimes, contrary to popular belief, will not see a neon jungle of motel signs. However, when they get there they do want a comfortable bed and a place for their children that is properly supervised, with swimming pools, competent lifeguards and that sort of thing. This accommodation is to be had as you drive your car through the parks. When you can drive no further you can hire a saddle horse and take trail rides. Then, if you are energetic enough you can hire a jeep or go walking. But these parks are so large that, even though you have made all this effort, you have probably seen only 5 per

[Mr. Ritchie.]

cent of the area of the western mountain parks.

I give that example merely to indicate that our parks are by no means fully developed. Some people contend that they should be left as wilderness. I should like to ask whether we are going to leave 95 per cent of our parks as complete wilderness which our visitors from Ottawa, Toronto or the Maritimes cannot enjoy to the full.

In defence of the minister—I say this sincerely—may I give one example of the sort of advice he gets. I should like to refer to an affidavit prepared by a firm of assessors, we are told one of the best in the country. In this affidavit they say:

—we have personally inspected the property, that to the best of our knowledge and belief the information given here is correct and that this appraisal is made in accordance with the standards of practice and professional ethics of the Appraisal Institute of Canada.

I suggest this is the sort of advice that has led to this proposal to establish a crown corporation. I have already said I object most strongly to this legislation. I should like to refer to a letter written by one of the persons in Waterton National Park in connection with this appraisal of property in the park:

General description states seven single units 12/24 which is correct but also states five double units 20/40 feet which is not correct as they are 24/24 feet each unit. Also there are four new units 12/24 feet instead of the two new double units as stated.

Having read the affidavit signed by the appraisers, I am wondering just what kind of advice the minister, and through the minister, the government, are getting. This is why I take exception to the legislation before the House.

I might also point out that the price paid by Mr. Goble for this property was \$71,250, not the price stated. It would not have been difficult for the appraiser to ascertain this if he visited the property personally and looked at it. The appraiser signed an affidavit which was accepted by the government and which is incorrect. This is evident from the letter written by the lessee to which I have referred. We are here in the House to consider these things. The Canadian public should now realize, perhaps belatedly, that regardless of whether this legislation is passed, only 5 per cent of these parklands is involved. This seems to be a good argument for further development of the parks.