

*The Address—Mr. Kindt*

downstream with 10,000 ants on it, and they want backbenchers to feel that every ant is steering the log. But what ant has got anything to do with steering the log? Each ant is just there as a fixture—and we are all in the same boat.

What I am saying is that we are not grappling with the problem of making parliament work effectively. I have talked to many Liberal backbenchers, and much of what I am saying today stems from their reactions. Backbenchers on both sides of the house share these views. If the Liberal party now in power wishes to improve the working relations among members of parliament, let it grapple with this problem. Let it come up with some ideas that will meet this feeling which backbenchers have. Give backbenchers something to look forward to. Give them a feeling that they are a part of this show. Give them something to do that is constructive.

Ministers say committees will discuss this particular legislation and that particular legislation, but after the committees have done their work the ministers do not even read the committee reports. They don't even look at them: They laugh at them, and backbenchers know this. If you are going to make this parliament work, come down to brass tacks. This is a feeling which is shared on all sides of the house. We should get down to the fundamentals of change so as to make parliament work better.

● (5:30 p.m.)

This is being disregarded. Cold water is being thrown on the efforts of parliament from one end of the nation to the other. A provincial conference is convened, the federal cabinet meets with all the provinces, and then comes up with some finished thought on the subject. Then perhaps they put it in the form of a government motion, which means it is rubberstamped. But not even the backbenchers on the Liberal side of the house have anything to say even in caucus about this policy. This is what they tell me.

If we are to correct some of these things we must grapple with them and find a solution to them. Parliament in its present form and in the way its committees are set up is not working. We are not getting the best there is from these people.

I should like now to talk about one or two other points. First of all, this morning I mentioned to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing) that there are many things going on which he should

[Mr. Kindt.]

know about. There is in particular the petition from 324 people of Banff who are protesting against the policy of this government on leases. In this connection I should like to read an editorial from the *Calgary Daily Herald* of Saturday, March 18, 1967. It reads as follows:

Residents of Banff and Jasper national parks have every right to be upset over recent news from Ottawa. A Commons committee which has been examining new parks leasehold policy being proposed by the parks branch of the federal department of northern affairs has approved it. In so doing, it has rejected objections which leaseholders in the two parks had registered against the new policy.

Under the new policy, commercial leases will be granted for a limited period of forty-two years without the leaseholder receiving payment for the improvements he has constructed on the property at the time the lease runs out. Vague assurance is given that the lease might be renewed under some partnership principle, but the simple fact is the investor will no longer own his buildings and improvements. Since it might be expected that a leaseholder would want to retire and turn his business over to someone else before the forty-two years was up, he would find himself in a difficult position. Who would want to buy up his business if it had only a few more years to run? Who wants to invest in a business which lacks the prospects of permanence? And who wants to build up a business which someone else is going to grab without compensation?

Furthermore, what businessman would continue to pay the costs of maintenance in first class condition of a building or buildings during the final few years of the lease, knowing that a fair value return could not be expected when the property had to be turned over to someone else without so much as a thank you when the inevitable deadline finally arrived?

Hon. Arthur Laing, the minister of the department in charge of the national parks, continues to have an unflinching instinct for keeping the people in the two big mountain parks in an unhappy state of alarm and dissatisfaction.

Despite his many protestations to the contrary, he and his staff of Ottawa civil servants still cling to the outdated concept that the mountain parks must be maintained in a semi-wilderness state to be passed on unimpaired (which can only mean practically unused) to future generations. This constitutes an utter denial of the more realistic view that the great scenic regions should be opened up in reasonable measure to growing numbers of scenic-hungry people.

What is the point of having beautiful scenery if it cannot be enjoyed at leisure except by a fortunate handful of people?

The towns of Banff and Jasper are there, whether or not some people wish otherwise. The railroad lines, the modern highways are there. And people want to travel over them. They want to find hotels and motels and camp grounds and services there. They want modern services and amenities. And who is supposed to provide these things? Not the government, we hope. This sort of thing has to be done properly and governments rarely do anything properly.