

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

parks shall be so maintained and made use of as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Now, in this rather colorful and interesting language we find the first difficulty. In fact this language produces a conflict between those people whom we might generally describe as conservationists, those people who would like to see the parks kept in their natural, raw state, and the large body of people who wish to use the parks for recreational purposes. I have a copy of a speech which the minister delivered at Jasper park, and he points out that the parks are, in fact, living museums of nature. Of course, we all agree with that statement. He went on further to say that they are to be maintained so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Having said this, he points out the great advantages of recreation, and then said that artificial recreational facilities cannot be permitted to develop to the point where they compete with the natural attractions that draw visitors to the parks. We certainly say amen to that. This statement however points out a contradiction which makes the administration of the parks extremely difficult for the officials, because how does one decide what is too much park development? Where do you draw the line? How do you write such a line of demarcation into legislation?

This, of course, is a never ending problem with which we are faced, and upon which the Crawford report comments. In fact the Crawford report states that all of us accept the fact there has to be some development. In the opening statement the report dealing with controls describes the element by which we determine how much is enough in terms of park development. This opening statement acknowledges:

That if there are to be visitors to the parks, then the parks cannot remain as examples of completely unspoiled nature.

In other words if we are to use the parks, if we are to have people coming from many other areas, and thus benefit our tourist trade, then we have to expect some development. If we are going to encourage people to come into our parks, especially when they are competing with other areas for the tourist dollar, then we are going to have to provide facilities which will persuade them to come back again. If we are going to promote international ski competitors throughout the world to come, we are going to have to provide facilities. If we are going to ask people to come and bring their youngsters and enjoy the natural scenic beauty of the parks, then I suggest once again we are going to have to provide more facilities for these youngsters and for the adults themselves.

[Mr. Smith (Calgary South).]

I am sure hon. members can recall an alleged statement of one of our colleagues to the effect that there is not very much for honeymooners to do in one particular park in Canada. I think basically his remark was correct. I am only sorry he put this one particular group of people in this category. I argue that we can provide a great many more facilities in terms of amusement without destroying the basic concept of the parks. It is because of this I am going to suggest how we might approach the problem.

I do not for a moment want any enthusiastic conservationist to jump up and suggest that I am going to argue that we turn the parks into Coney islands, that we clutter them up with too many facilities and too many bright lights or that we destroy the natural qualities. No, Mr. Chairman; I would oppose that procedure just as much as anyone else. However, I suggest that the line must be drawn. I suggest that we might take one of two courses, either by zoning the park areas, and permit a program of orderly development, and then keep the balance of the parks in their natural state.

After all, we have 42,000 square miles of parks. That is a fairly substantial area. Many of the townsites could be still further improved without in any way destroying the natural qualities of the surrounding areas. In fact if you zone many of these parks—and the ones I am most familiar with are Banff and Lake Louise—you have natural geographical divisions in which these boundaries could be readily recognized, and you would not then have this conflict with the conservationist who wished to keep the outlying areas, as I have said, in their natural state. Let me say that I would then support the conversationist on this principle. In fact I would not even permit the extension of some of the developments that have taken place in many areas which could be kept in their native state, after we had established expanded recreational areas properly zoned.

I go back to the point I made initially, namely that in those areas which we have zoned for the development of townsites, I think we are being entirely too restrictive with regard to what is permitted, and the basis on which we are prepared to allow the construction of the particular facilities.

I suggest that there is a second alternative. The first one I mentioned is by a zoning principal. The second alternative is that we might be able to carry out a grading of parks themselves; that is to say, park A in a particular province could be termed a nature museum, as the minister has described. Park B could be developed for additional recreational facilities, but not to the extent where we are going to have vast