

*National Parks Act*

countless hundreds of people who come to enjoy the tournament and to take in the weekend at the park when it is in progress.

On occasion, the sponsors of this golf tournament have approached me to see whether the minister would take into consideration the great contribution that it is making at the opening of the season at Clear Lake National Park, and whether certain regulations in relation to the fees normally charged could be altered so that either a subsidy could be granted or at least a special fee set. I understand that this is done in some parts of Canada, but on several occasions when I have approached the minister he has told me this would be impossible.

● (9:50 p.m.)

To get back to what I said previously, in some respects it may be better for a Crown corporation to take over the administration of the parks, although I would not agree to a full takeover. I would point out that Air Canada, which is a Crown corporation, and Canadian National Railways offer beneficial rates to large parties; they have group fares. But this government will give no consideration to a tournament the size of the Grey Owl golf tournament held in Clear Lake National Park. Green fees last year were raised to \$4 and the tournament officials were told, "If you have 300 golfers, you will pay \$1,200 for them to play one round apiece." This means \$2,400 for the two rounds which they play. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, perhaps a Crown corporation would do a better job than the government is doing. However, I reiterate that I am not in favour of the government turning over all its responsibilities to a Crown corporation.

We all know the many concerns of the people residing in the national parks and of those operating businesses in the parks. In December, 1966, as a result of many protests from residents of the western parks arising from cancellation of long-standing, historic leasing rights by order in council, the Standing Committee on Northern Affairs and National Resources visited Banff and Jasper on a fact-finding mission. During hearings lasting three days the committee found that the citizens affected agreed with the necessity for a change in leasing policy to meet the growing recreational needs of today, while at the same time conforming to the conservation principles of wise management and multiple use of our renewable resources which emerged from the Resources for Tomorrow Conference of 1961.

The protests arose because the changes were made by administrative decree rather than by act of Parliament, and also because cancellation of perpetual leases provided no compensation in respect of commercial properties. The main protest at that time was supported by a comprehensive brief presented by Mr. G. H. Steer, Q.C., of Edmonton, which argued the illegality of government action by order in council rather than by act of Parliament. But, Mr. Speaker, the committee report tabled in the House completely ignored those representations.

It is no wonder that the leaseholders in many of our parks are at their wits end to know what compensation they can get and what hearing they will receive from a government that arbitrarily passes laws of this nature by order in council. It makes one wonder just what the position of these leaseholders would be if the administration of parks were turned over to a Crown corporation. We all know what has happened in recent times with respect to individuals dealing with Crown corporations. I cite the example of the city of Winnipeg and the people of Manitoba generally and the great difficulty they had when Air Canada decided to move its facilities from Winnipeg to Montreal. The people concerned in Winnipeg are still looking for answers, mainly because they feel they could not pin the government down since it was a decision by a Crown corporation. The findings of the committee at that time were another example of the growing tendency of the government to implement policies by administrative decree rather than by parliamentary action.

Mr. Speaker, my time is drawing to a close. We in Manitoba have repeatedly requested through the provincial government that the federal government establish a second national park in our province. If one asks representatives of the provincial government, they say that they cannot get an answer from Ottawa. I have approached representatives of the federal government, and they say that Manitoba must make the first move. This creates a very difficult situation for people in all parts of Manitoba.

We in the northern part of the province hoped that the second national park in Manitoba would be situated in an area north of or closely adjacent to the 55th parallel. However, we have been told that studies were made of that area which showed it was not suitable for a national park, and that other areas were being examined. The people living