

modern tendencies. Indeed in England the Lord Chancellor appointed a commission to investigate this sort of thing and put a stop to it. The Lord Chief Justice calls regulations of this character the new despotism. In this case you have a cabinet depending entirely upon a western representative because, there being no Minister of the Interior now, I suppose the Department of Indian Affairs will be charged with the responsibility of saying how people living in the parks will be treated. Does the minister think this is fair or right or just?

The way in which this is being palmed off on the public is the amusing part. The permanent officials have added to section 4 these words:

So as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This is taken up by the newspapers and propaganda is circulated amongst the people stating that there is to be no commercializing of the parks. The minister himself, after the outcry in parliament against commercializing the parks, visited Spray lakes. He climbed one mountain and I think it took him half a day to go up on horseback. He saw they were going to build a dam at a lake mentioned to make the water available for power. There is a lake called lake Minnewanka with some trees about it, and the government obtains some power there. A dam was put there once by a company with which I was at one time associated. The water in this lake has been raised and it should be raised still higher in order to supply electric current to the prairies when the water in the winter is very low. Oh no, we are to leave unimpaired for future generations the glorious beauties of lake Minnewanka! Is that the minister's conception of the matter? The government themselves have built a power plant there and they have not left it unimpaired for future generations. Having done that, they have built roads; they have not left the country in a state of nature. The trails of the Indians in the early days are not the trails now. Instead of that we have excellent roads.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Roads are quite useful, are they not?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but the clause reads:

So as to leave "the parks" unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Under those words there would be no roads, no villages, no settlements, so that the people might journey into wilderness and gaze upon the beauties of nature, although the government know there are great hotels where hun-

[Mr. Bennett.]

dreds of thousands of people are accommodated during the year and where, if you will, a thousand people can be accommodated on a single night. The government know that the people are living there and that they have made their homes there for generations. These people are subject to this despotism. I would like to see the Minister of Justice have to live under it for ten days and then hear him talk about the glories of this modern free liberalism that is put upon the people. It is substituting for the legislature of Alberta the governor in council.

It is idle further to point out what this means with respect to the parks. The government say: We are going to put it through and no one apparently cares very much about it. Let me come now to the more important point, the question of administration. This is Dominion property which is going to be administered as though it were an island in the middle of a province belonging to a foreign power. That is what it means. Is that right or fair or just? If the government were to try this in Ontario they would see how far they would get away with it.

The next point is this. For some time there has been a citizens' council at Banff which came into being by the action of the department itself. The department said: We welcome the idea of an elected citizens' committee at Banff for the purpose of aiding in the administration of the park. Let me point out how much aid they are. They make recommendations and so long as the latter are in accordance with the ideas of the government officials, all is well. But if the recommendations they make are at variance with the idea of the government, then they are all wrong, and never should have existed. Is such a provision of any value? I submit it is not and before this bill is finally put through I propose to offer an amendment—and I have been working out how it could be introduced—to provide that in those parks where the population exceeds 100 or some other figure that may be agreed upon, the council shall have some powers of municipal government. As the situation exists at present, a man with a family is without freedom in the community. I repeat this is substituting for the legislature at Edmonton or the capital of one of the provinces the governor in council and the officials reflect that attitude of mind that is always expressed in the exercise of power that flows from a governor in council—for the moment I am not talking about partyism or politics—and it reflects the attitude of mind of the enacting power when it is the