

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

tion arose because the Americans had put a prohibition on imports of beef from those countries. Canada was in the position of being exempt from those prohibitions.

As a result of the distress we were causing the American market by allowing this beef to come through Canada, and the threat that our free entry into the American market could be prohibited if we did not do something about it, we made representations to New Zealand and Australia. We obtained agreement from them that they would not ship beef into Canada during the period in which it would cause distress. At the time this agreement was reached there were shipments on the high seas on their way to Canada, and it took some time to clear these shipments out of the Canadian market. The agreement that we made with those countries at the time was that they would suspend shipments until such time as all this beef was cleared out of the Canadian market. Since then we have not had this problem.

● (10:10 p.m.)

It is true that the New Zealanders and Australians generally ship low-grade, or manufacturing beef to Canada, the sort which goes into wieners and manufactured goods of that kind. We anticipate that if the problem should arise again we would have no difficulty in taking the same kind of action and obtaining the same kind of agreement from the New Zealanders and Australians that we obtained previously. If that occasion arises we will have no hesitation in asking them to take the same action.

The hon. member suggests that we should put artificial embargoes on the importation of beef from other countries.

Mr. Gleave: Not artificial, real ones.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Real embargoes. This is a temptation. I think that all producers in Canada would like to have free access to every market in the world and prohibit imports to this country. May I remind the hon. member that every time we put up a barrier against somebody else's goods there is a temptation for them to put up a barrier against ours. We are fighting a trade war with other countries—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—VANCOUVER—SUGGESTED
REFUSAL OF LEASE TO FOUR SEASONS HOTEL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the matter I raise tonight is of vital concern not only to the citizens of Vancouver but to all Canadians. Stanley Park is an incomparable asset, one thousand acres of beauty and recreation, owned and open to the public of this country and invaluable as a tourist attraction. At this moment its future is in jeopardy.

Over the years the Vancouver city council has spurned the only over-all plan the city ever had and has released more and more nearby waterfront areas to private land speculators and developers. One of these, Harbour Park Developments Limited, made 200 per cent speculative

[Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary).]

profit on these holdings between 1965 and 1969. Now the city council is on the verge of allowing a \$40 million hotel, apartment and specialty store complex to be built on the 14-acre waterfront lot at the entrance to Stanley Park. Instead of open park space and a magnificent view of mountains and harbour, we are going to get a concrete jungle within 24 feet of the park, an impossible traffic situation in an already congested artery and a betrayal of public trust on a grand scale.

This is the time for plain talk, and I wish the minister were here tonight to deal with the question. This cluttered, greedy plan is a steal, and a steal possible only under the cloak of secrecy and evasion. The only public authority prepared to fight for the public and to save Stanley Park for the people has been the Vancouver parks board. For years they have done all they can to protect one of Vancouver's greatest assets.

Where does the National Harbours Board come in? The truth is that much of the land on which this Four Seasons cement colossus is to be built is owned by the National Harbours Board, whose signature is required for the lease. Further, one piece of the land, the Gilford Street waterlot, which was deeded by the National Harbours Board to the city in 1917 so that the public could have access to the water, is now in the process of being deeded back to the Crown by the city of Vancouver for the sum of one dollar so that the National Harbours Board may have everything in order for the signing of the lease.

In 1917 the Harbours Board gave a waterlot to Vancouver so that the public could have access to the water. Apparently today's Harbour Board is prepared to aid private speculators and developers to fence the public away from water, mountains and parks. I challenge the minister to refute this charge. I challenge him to carry out his duty to preserve and protect the heritage of the waterfront for the public. Let him refuse to sanction this lease. Let him listen to the Vancouver parks board and organized citizen bodies in the city of Vancouver. Let him negotiate with the city council to protect the rights of Canadians from coast to coast who have a share in the ownership of Stanley Park which is, as you know, owned by the Department of National Defence and leased to the city of Vancouver.

At the very least, let the minister look at the compromise plan of the Vancouver parks board, a plan which would preserve the block next to the park for public use. This plan would leave the private developers with the second block. It would allow the parks board to develop a fisherman's wharf and restaurants such as have made San Francisco famous, to build a public, revenue-producing marina and a variety of other self-financing attractions.

Wherever you are, Mr. Minister, will you decide for a few well placed persons, or for the whole community? Will you go along with private speculators, or save irreplaceable public land? You have the power to stop this violation of public trust on the part of a few shortsighted people who would sell out the public heritage for a few pieces of paper. The decision is yours; where do you stand?