

National Parks Act

company has exclusive possession of certain property on block F, according to a plan approved and confirmed by the surveyor general in 1909. The lease gives the company exclusive possession of that property which extends to a point within 16 feet of the shore of lake Louise.

Representations were made to the department last year by the company to the effect that there was trespassing on the property, that people were stamping on the flower beds and going into the hotel when they were not guests. The manager of the hotel asked the departmental officials if it would be in order to construct an ornamental fence surrounding the property, and that permission was given.

The fence leaves plenty of space for people who want to visit lake Louise to come in from the main road to the shore of the lake and around the lake. As I say, the property leased to the company starts only 16 feet from the lake shore. It should be understood that when a lease is granted, the people who hold that lease have exclusive possession.

The same provisions apply in connection with schools, churches, hospitals and places of entertainment. I am sure my hon. friend would not like to have hundreds of people walking through the corridors of a hospital simply because it was located on national park property. That is why we give exclusive possession. These leases are issued or granted after a good deal of consideration and after the procedure I explained yesterday in answer to a question by the hon. member for Macleod has been followed. Frankly I cannot see that we can adopt any other sensible policy under the circumstances.

Mr. Hansell: I understand that when the hotel wanted to erect a fence they got permission from the minister?

Mr. Lesage: I did not say that they got permission from the minister. I said that they advised the departmental officials who replied that they had no objection.

Mr. Hansell: Was the type of fence approved by the minister of the department? My argument is that this fence has spoiled everything. I agree that we cannot have hundreds of people walking through the halls of a hotel, but that could have been prevented without erecting a high board fence. I claim that a small simple fence with a few signs "For guests only" on the inside would have served the same purpose. This fence has completely spoiled the view, in fact I think it has spoiled the view for guests inside the hotel. A simple fence about three or four feet high with a few signs around would have served the purpose. They could have

had a few commissionaires placed there; and even if we had to stand the expense of those commissionaires it would have solved the problem. As it is now, the thing is all messed up.

I want to know if the government approved this high board fence. I would like to ask further if the government will prevail upon the hotel authorities to take down that fence and put up one that will not obstruct the view. I believe that is a reasonable thing to ask.

Mr. Lesage: When the manager of the hotel wrote to the departmental officials he submitted a sketch of ornamental gateways which he proposed to construct at the rear of the hotel at two points facing lake Louise, and a plan of a peeled pole fence was also submitted. It is difficult for me to act as judge between the departmental officials and my hon. friend. I assure him that when I visit the park next summer I shall examine this fence and then I will be in position to give a personal opinion on it.

Mr. Shaw: I have one further question with respect to the matter I brought up a few moments ago. When a permit is granted for the grazing of horses and cattle within a specified area in the park does that carry with it the right to prevent other persons entering upon that particular area? There have been complaints made to me that in certain sections of Banff national park a certain concern holding a lease for the grazing of horses have put up "no trespassing" signs, with the result that people are prevented from entering upon a very substantial area within the park. That is the way it was represented to me, although I am not certain of the facts; but does such a permit carry with it the right to bar other persons from that specific area?

Mr. Lesage: It does not, and I will be glad if my hon. friend will give me details of the case he has in mind so we can go into this.

Mr. Shaw: I will be glad to convey to the minister the information that has been sent to me.

Mr. Herridge: Section 3, paragraph (i), subparagraph (iii) reads as follows:

The cutting and removal of dead or diseased timber and such green timber as may be necessary for the protection and management of forests in a park.

It appears to me that the word "management" is an amendment to the former paragraph which did not exist under the old act. I would like to ask the minister this question. What does management mean? Does it mean that management did not exist before,