

*National Parks Act*

The minister and his officials can see only wilderness parks, and completely overlook the recreational aspect of such areas. They are not mutually exclusive. We can enjoy both wilderness and recreation within the same general region. Recreational needs and recreational development are confined to a relatively small section of any region such as national park. There is room to spare for thousands of miles of wilderness around such areas. The fact is the two should be complementary and would be complementary if only the Ottawa officials would stop meddling with things they obviously know little or nothing about.

The beauty of existing national parks is that we can have both types of areas. I would suggest that this fact be recognized by creating, not a cumbersome and deadening overburden such as a Crown corporation, but national wilderness parks, clearly defined by legislation. These would be complemented by simultaneous creation of national recreation areas. I believe, however, that the administration of the two should be absolutely separate. The national recreation areas could be transferred to another federal department, perhaps National Health and Welfare, or turned back to the provinces.

The national wilderness parks would be protected by specific legislation from any commercial, industrial, developmental, or extractive enterprise except, as necessary, the cutting of timber in the strict interests of conservation. The national recreation areas would be similarly restricted as to industrial or extractive activity but would be open to regulated commercial enterprise and development. That is what tourists want and expect in a recreation area—and tourism is the very best type of foreign exchange earner. There is no danger of foreign takeovers with tourists.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I must repeat that I find it difficult to credit the minister with such boorish behaviour and disregard for Parliament as giving the debate on his own legislation such cavalier treatment. It amounts to a callous disregard for the individual Canadians most closely affected by this legislation. This appears to be a current trend in Liberal administration.

Only recently we witnessed another glaring example of the slighting of Parliament when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) chose to announce in detail certain important organizational changes in his department to the press and to the public rather than to Parliament. He was followed by his leader, who reserved his gems of wisdom

[Mr. Schumacher.]

for the CBC. As far as I am concerned, this bill should not be allowed to proceed beyond the present stage, at least until the minister recognizes his responsibility and comes into this chamber prepared to answer the questions which have been raised by hon. members on both sides.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, we are now witnessing another controversy as a result of the government's attempt to force a Crown corporation upon the leaseholders in our western national parks.

The government has been trying to get rid of long-standing residents in the parks for a long time. Now, they are attempting to complete the process. Acting unilaterally, they raised rents to astronomic heights and abrogated long-standing leases which residents could normally expect to be continued. There has been a continued refusal to allow these residents any say as to their future. The minister suggested that the residents of Banff and Jasper could move out if they did not like conditions there. Perhaps I would sound facetious if I suggested that in the course of the minister's forthcoming journey to Siberia he will be looking for a place in which these residents could settle. This would be in line with his comment that if they didn't like conditions where they were living they should move out.

After all, to the bureaucrats who administer the parks, people are a nuisance. Once the administration of leaseholds is handed over to a Crown corporation, the government will not be obliged to answer to these citizens and to their representatives in Parliament. There will be no way in which any citizen living in a national park will be able to make his voice heard. This is in line with the policy of the present government, a government without heart or soul. This approach to administration by a professorial government is in line with an experiment in sociology. The government looks on the Canadian people as subjects for a sociological experiment. We have heard a great deal about participatory democracy. We have heard of the just society. All we are getting is an experiment in how citizens will react to a given set of stimuli. The minister has rarely appeared in the House to defend his own bill, perhaps because he realizes that it cannot be defended. The government should come out from behind the smoke-screen. It should abandon this idea of a Crown corporation. It should make itself responsible for its actions, and administer its park policy