

*Adjournment Debate*

was solely because of the pressures applied by other African nations who were due to assemble in Kampala and did not want to be embarrassed by this horrible situation.

The President of the Privy Council should be made aware, if he is not already, that one commentator speaking on a Canadian network indicated that he has known President Amin for some time and that there is every likelihood that this man suffers from a very serious debilitating mind-warping social disease. I am not suggesting this is true, but it has been strongly indicated.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I would ask the President of the Privy Council when we can expect a demonstration of intestinal fortitude and less cotton candy diplomacy. Is he prepared to speak out, or is Canada prepared to speak out at the United Nations about the conduct of this nation? It is all very well for countries to condemn Rhodesia and South Africa, but now the shoe is on the other foot. Are we to sit back and allow this to happen to nationals of other countries who happen to be in a black nation?

**Mr. Herb Breau (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, if I may comment on what the hon. member said at the end of his speech, I assure him that Canada will continue to intervene in foreign affairs productively, and not with rhetoric. This government is doing what it considers must be done, although its actions are not necessarily those the hon. member is suggesting.

**An hon. Member:** Name one.

**Mr. Breau:** The hon. member suggests I should mention one thing the government has done. Let me point to what it has done for some years on Cyprus. That has saved lives. The government does not indulge in rhetoric, and do what the hon. member suggests it ought to do. It acted by exercising cool, rational diplomacy.

The Canadian government has closely followed the events surrounding the imprisonment and sentencing of Mr. Dennis Hills. As Mr. Hills is a citizen of the United Kingdom, his case is primarily of concern to the British and Ugandan governments. Nonetheless, the question has been of great interest to us for evident humanitarian reasons.

With regard to the question of CIDA aid to Uganda, our aid program has been maintained at a very modest level since 1972. The program has consisted primarily of scholarship support to Uganda students studying in Canada and in African countries other than Uganda. No new aid commitments have been made since 1972. The Canadian government does not feel that it would be acceptable policy to use our aid programs to influence the actions of foreign governments. We do not believe that humanitarian ends would be well served, in the long run, by such a policy.

The government did express to the Ugandan authorities, through diplomatic channels, our hope that Mr. Hills' life would be spared. At about the same time it was learned that Mr. Hills' sentence would not be carried out. We informed the Ugandan authorities of our satisfaction with this decision. Finally, the government fully intends to keep abreast of any further developments.

[Mr. Brisco.]

NATIONAL PARKS—BANFF—REQUEST NEW HOUSING BE  
MADE AVAILABLE IN TOWN

**Mr. Joe Clark (Rocky Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, this evening I shall speak briefly about housing in a community which is virtually under the complete control of the Government of Canada. I am speaking of the town site in the national park of Banff, and also, to a small degree, of the one in Jasper.

As I begin to speak I must express some unhappiness. I am addressing my remarks not to the minister concerned, not even to the parliamentary secretary who is concerned, but to a representative of the government who, so far as I know, has never been in one of those national parks.

**Mr. Breau:** He has been there.

**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):** All right; he has been there.

The problem of housing in the national parks involves a conflict which is recognized by all. If there is too much growth, that very growth jeopardizes park values and the purposes for which the national parks were established. But if there are too few houses, and there are in Banff, that shortage can create unacceptable crowding, social problems, and tension such as is being experienced now, unfortunately, in that community.

Instead of responding to the request of the Banff Advisory Council—the closest thing they have to a government in Banff, because of the Government of Canada's insistence on retaining control of such momentous matters as the licensing of dogs in the town—the minister replied, by and large, that because a new master plan is being developed it would be better to meet the housing problems of Banff by having people move to Canmore, which is just outside the park, perhaps 20 minutes drive away, and have them commute to the park. That was the minister's policy for some time. The town of Canmore was not too happy with it, because it had a serious effect on its future. That policy turned the town more and more into a bedroom town, into a simple dormitory. Secondly, it very seriously jeopardized and undercut its tax base.

● (2210)

The town council of Canmore, having more power in these matters than the elected officials of Banff, said to the minister "No. We are not going to let you do that. We are not going to let the new residential lots in our town be available to people who do not live and work here." That has thrown quite a curve into the minister's plans of trying to meet the housing problems of Banff by shunting them off to another community.

That led to my question in the House almost a month ago as to whether the minister was prepared to give some consideration on a fresh basis, in line with the decision by the town council of Canmore, to allowing the release of some new lots and the building of some new houses immediately in Banff so that there could be some response to a housing pressure and a housing shortage that would not be tolerated by most members of this House if they, the communities in which they live, or their constituencies faced it.