

National Parks Act

page 792 of *Hansard* of yesterday. In reference to the installation of a water supply in any of these national parks the minister said:

. . . and reasonable charges would be made for the water supplied.

I suppose that applies to any utility supplied in the national park. For example, would it apply to hydroelectric power?

Mr. Lesage: Definitely; and if what the hon. member has in mind are the charges for power in Riding Mountain park, which he mentioned yesterday, I am pleased to tell him that as of April 1, 1954, there will be a reduction in the charges for power in Riding Mountain park. Representations have been made by the hon. member, the parliamentary assistant to the Prime Minister, and also the hon. member for Dauphin. I had occasion to write to the other two hon. members in answer to their letters. I did not receive any letter from the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, and that is the reason I did not advise him of that decision, which is effective as of April 1, 1954.

Mr. Hansell: Are the leases that are given for the erection of buildings and so forth held more or less in perpetuity? The other night the hon. member for Bow River indicated his displeasure at the high, sort of ranch-looking fence put around the chateau at lake Louise. It has caused some considerable comment and I might say disgust in many quarters. We who live out in Alberta, some of us not far from the Banff national park who can go there and get back in a day, have heard a tremendous amount of comment. When the hon. member for Bow River raised the question the other night, the minister interjected: "Well, that is private property."

How does it come about that anyone, an individual or a company, can own as their own private property any location situated in the middle of a national park? I can quite understand that where there is a town site and people lease a piece of property for 99 years, which is tantamount to buying it, and build a house on it, they have naturally the right to put a fence around it to keep not only people but animals away; but I cannot quite understand why a hotel can put a fence around its property without some permission from the minister. I wish he would explain that to us. I am interested in it because we hear these comments. We go up around these places ourselves occasionally.

It might be said that it is private property, and that people going over private property would ruin flowers, flower beds, grass and so forth. That is a pretty slim excuse. A great many tourists visit the park.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

The Chairman: Order. May I remind the hon. member for Macleod that we are discussing clause 3 of Bill No. 28, and this paragraph deals with licences for schools, hospitals and churches; it does not deal with other types of licences.

Mr. Hansell: I thought we were discussing clause 3, which provides for the granting of leases for places of entertainment. I cannot understand why I should be out of order in raising a question as to whether a person can lease a piece of property and do what he likes with it without the minister's permission. Are they given a lease and with that lease permission to go ahead and do what they want with it? Surely that is not the case.

I do not think that fence should have been built without the permission of the minister. I do not think there is any necessity for it. I think the problem could have been solved without building the fence. I was up there dozens of times before the fence was built and—

The Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member once more, but I fail to find in clause 3 any reference to a lease of property such as the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Hansell: I do not want to pursue a matter that is not in order and I do not like to object to any of your rulings. Paragraph (g) provides for the granting of leases of lots in town sites for the purposes of residence, trade, schools, churches, hospitals and places of entertainment and of lots in other subdivisions for the purpose of residence during the period beginning April 1 and ending October 31. That is the very time this hotel is open. People are living in the hotel during that time. However, I shall stop my discussion on this matter if it does not meet with your approval, Mr. Chairman, and let the minister answer.

Mr. Lesage: According to the act and the regulations, leases for lots in town sites and subdivisions can be issued by the minister for any term not exceeding 42 years. When we were either at the resolution stage or the second reading of the bill I answered a series of questions put by the hon. member for Macleod and explained that these leases for lots or licences were issued by the minister usually after calling for tenders and with certain guarantees.

That is what happened at lake Louise. The lease does not grant title to the property but it does grant exclusive possession of the land, that is possession to the exclusion of others. Therefore the Canadian Pacific hotel