

National Parks Act

just as well park one's car or trailer outside a motel and use the facilities of the motel, because it would cost just as much to stay in the park.

Although I do not have much experience of the western parks, I have had the opportunity to visit Gatineau Park on a number of occasions. I have travelled up to Lac Philippe on a number of occasions and I must say I am impressed with that park. I think the people of Quebec who say they want to take everything over would look enviously at the Gatineau Parkway and at the job the federal government has done in that area. Anyone who wishes to take a tent or a trailer and go into that area will find it possible to spend an economical and enjoyable holiday. This is how it should be. Banff National Park demonstrates the beauty of the area to the best advantage and so does Gatineau Park, which compares favourably with any area which could have been chosen.

I am pleased with the way in which the parks are run. With one or two exceptions, the officials who operate them have always been courteous and efficient. There is one exception I should like to mention, and I am reminded of it when I go to Gatineau. As the years have gone by and as the park has expanded, new gates have been added. Since the Prime Minister's residence has been established in the area, there are a few gates which were not there originally. To go where I wish to go sometimes requires a certain amount of politics, some manoeuvring and occasionally a little brow-beating. But in the end we get there anyway.

If a change is made, the only change I can foresee is in the direction of making the parks pay for themselves. There are a good many facilities provided in all the parks I have visited and the cost of these facilities is obviously not covered completely by the fees paid by people who visit them. I have always enjoyed going to parks. I remember one time when I was campaigning in the Hanover area. This was a very peculiar area: it is true there were hotels there, but they closed at nine o'clock, possibly because they had no beer or liquor facilities and there really did not seem to be much point in their remaining open.

An hon. Member: What was the point of staying there?

Mr. Peters: I remember spending a few months politicking in the area. We were never sure when a meeting would end. When I drove through that community I always

[Mr. Peters.]

found the hotel doors locked; nobody seemed to be interested in letting a room. But there was a beautiful little park where one could rent a cabin with a bed in it and hot and cold running water. I enjoyed those facilities every time I visited the area, provided it was during the summer months.

Most of the park facilities provide reasonable comfort and one ought not to expect that the price should have a direct relationship to the cost of maintaining these services. If a Crown corporation is set up, there is no doubt in my mind that an attempt will be made to make these services pay for themselves and cover the cost of any additional services provided. It is obvious that the public is demanding more and more accommodation year by year, so the cost will go up.

I recall something which always burned me up. I suppose this happens to other people whenever they start thinking of politicians. I remember a member of the provincial legislature in Timmins, where I lived for a number of years: later he became the minister of lands and forests. There was a very beautiful area outside Timmins containing about 20 little lakes. You could drive through that area. It had been logged years ago. In some lakes you could fish; in others you could swim. Others were attractive lakes where you could have picnics. It was all very rustic, and all very cheap. After this man became minister, what did he do? He put a fence around this area and charged everybody who came in \$2.

Many of the people who had been brought up near this area felt they owned it. It was Crown land, and they had used it for years. I objected strongly to paying \$2. But worse was to come. The fee was increased to \$5. I suppose that this year it will be \$10.00—to do exactly the same thing as we were able to do before for nothing. Sometimes the beauty of a park is the low cost you pay for it and the advantage you get from a scenic outing that really does not cost you anything.

It occurs to me that among the provinces the federal parks branch has overlooked is the province of Ontario. We have two or three very small national parks there. I suppose you could put one of them into the grounds of Parliament Hill. When I say they are small, they are really small. This is surely not what the national parks legislation really had in mind. The intention, I am sure, was to set up parks which would demonstrate the best or the most scenic areas of the provinces. The seeming neglect of Ontario probably