

they want to sell their houses they will be obliged to sell them to the government because, as I say, we do not want a repetition of the situations at Banff and Jasper.

I may say that this is a departure from the original policy, which was recognized in the committee as being harsh. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that when I see a mistake I am ready to correct it. But if there are only one or two mistakes I ask why should we deprive future generations of Canadian citizens from enjoying some of the best beauty spots in Canada that we can take steps to preserve now? If we had not moved quickly, Halifax would never have had a coastal national park close to it, and Newfoundland would not have Gros Morne National Park which includes some of the most beautiful fiords in Canada. New Brunswick would not have the Kouchibouguac area preserved as a national park, and Vancouver Island would never have a national park. I believe that in 10 years from now all coastal lands will be taken up by private owners, many of them non-residents of Canada. We have moved quickly and made a few mistakes, but in the long run we have acted to preserve the most beautiful parts of our land.

The hon. member also talked about the consultants' reports that we have not tabled. I have the list here, Mr. Speaker. There were 18 different consultants' reports involving lease-hold lands and related problems in national parks in Canada, from 1963 to 1973. Out of the 18, eight have been released to the public completely; three, because of the nature of the report—and they were very narrow in scope—were available to the Jasper Chamber of Commerce, to the public in the park. Three will be released on request. They are available and there are only three that have not been released and will not be. One of them is related to the lease problem and involved confidential information about the business operation of businessmen in the park. We have some obligation to those people who, in good faith, gave information to the government about their financial position in the development. There is another concerning the form of municipal government which is quite an old report; the data is outdated and not related to the situation today because of the growth in the number of visitors to the park. There is another related to the lower Lake Louise commercial development. It was a preliminary report and led to the proposition of the lower village at Lake Louise. All the information was available in discussions at public hearings held last year which led to the decision to say no to this development.

● (1710)

I was in Banff last week and I did not know this debate was coming up. I had the pleasure of accompanying Mrs. Gandhi in Banff and had a few hours to enjoy the great panorama there, one of the most beautiful spots in this land. When I came back I had occasion to meet with a group interested in the housing situation. I have recognized in the committee and here that, because of the growth of population in Banff, some people are living in places like Canmore, 11 miles away from the town. People want to live in the park because it is so beautiful. I understand that but at the same time we have the problem of people who are just summer residents and people who are no longer active in Banff. I do not think we can allow Banff to become a city of retired people. We discussed that

### *Estimates*

and they came up with some suggestions to which I hope we will be able to respond.

**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I hesitated to raise it because I thought the minister might make a remark that would occasion another one. My point of order relates to giving to the House information which is incomplete, and in a way that is misleading. The reply I received dated February 19 contains no reference, despite a question which would have invited such reference, to the fact that the reports to which the minister now refers as being available, would be available. Either there has been a change in policy or the minister, at the time of tabling that earlier reply, was denying to the House of Commons information and his response to the question on the order paper was misleading.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to comment on this point of order. I say there is in the reports confidential information and that is why they were not released before. Sometimes I have been able to take out from the report some of this confidential information and make the report available. If that is the case now, I will check and report. I do not want to mislead anyone. The point I want to make is that out of 18 different reports in a period of ten years, 15 were made public one way or another and the others, for good reason, were not.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has claimed that if we are moving now it is because of the Alberta government. I must say that I was privileged during the last two years to have as my parliamentary secretary the former member from Rocky Mountain. He is the one who started this and who convinced me and the people of Banff to try to find a compromise. I hope it is coming to fruition now and I think one should be thankful for that. Everyone knows that it was Allen Sulatycky. We had been working on a compromise long before that, but it did not come to fruition. We needed to convince the people and to be convinced ourselves. We have a mandate, and it is very good to satisfy the people there. Our mandate is a very important one.

I had a very good discussion with those people. Some top decisions have to be made, but if they are made by me at this time the hon. member will get up and say it is a bureaucratic decision from Ottawa. I like to meet the people in Banff who have raised some very fundamental questions like the right of people who do not have permanent residences in the park, to be there. If I am to do that the hon. member knows the kind of abuses to which I would be subjected. If the people of Banff want to make that kind of decision, I will oblige but that will be real participation. I hope we will form an agreement with the Banff Advisory Council to give them more autonomy. To my surprise, at this time I am informed that we were even willing to give more than they felt was needed. There was a lot of research and discussion by my former parliamentary secretary and, of course, by the president of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development who had a special assignment on that. Before Mr. Sulatycky became my parliamentary secretary, there had been discussion with these people.