

National Parks Act

17,000 to 18,000 acres, of which only 5,000 or 6,000 acres would be used for the airport facilities. Further, of course, if it is not developed as a major airport but is simply used as a STOL airport, then it is only a matter of 1,000 acres that would be needed for the actual facilities. This would leave 16,000 or 17,000 acres available on the doorstep of Toronto to be used for parkland, for walkways, for trails, in the winter as a ski area, where streams could be cleaned up, dams and small lakes created, all providing magnificent facilities for a major metropolis that desperately needs them.

I can think, too, of our great hydroelectric projects, of the James Bay project and others. Here I am not making a judgment on the James Bay project, but if it were to go ahead, particularly on a limited scale, and if the amount of land it opened up were developed not only as a hydroelectric project site but as a park site, with great thought and care put into its development, its potential is tremendous.

There are other properties that belong to the Department of National Defence that could be developed in this way. Here I think of the Meaford range on Georgian Bay. It has been used as a tank firing range, an artillery firing range. We are told that the cost of clearing it and getting the unexploded bombs out of it is considered excessive. One of my hon. friends says prohibitive. I do not believe it is prohibitive. It may appear prohibitive at the present time, but I point out that the price of gasoline was considered excessive six months ago, yet today it is not considered prohibitive. This land would be invaluable as a park. The sooner we get on with the job of clearing it, the less expensive it will be. Perhaps we could commit ourselves to a ten-year program or a 20-year program to clean it up, and at the end of that time we will have a great facility available for the enjoyment of the people of southern Ontario.

Another area which we have to consider with respect to the development of park land near a city is in British Columbia, where Vancouver will become the third largest metropolis in Canada by 1980. I think without doubt it is the most beautiful city in Canada. I only hope my constituents will forgive me for saying that. But it is locked in by mountains, with beautiful homes still being built right up to the feet of those mountains. It may be inappropriate for a Torontonians to say that a degree of irresponsibility was shown in allowing such development to take place. It is unforgivable, but now things are changing. As I say, the people of Vancouver are living in the midst of some of the greatest beauty in the world, but within a short few years they will not be able to enjoy it unless we go ahead with urban park planning.

I have spoken in this House on previous occasions about what I believe would be a worth-while program, a national youth service which could perform non-military service in areas such as parks. Think what such a group could do over a period of years. Young people devoting one year to the service of their country could help develop parks and youth hostels. The time thus occupied would be absolutely unlimited and young people would undertake this sort of thing with enthusiasm. It is the sort of thing that is attractive to them. They would realize the worth of it.

True, there are programs such as the Local Initiatives Program that can be used in this way. But I am thinking

[Mr. Danson.]

on a broader scale, with tens of thousands of young men and women committed to a year of service to their country. There are many things they could do, but one of the most important would involve them in the work of developing recreational areas and national parks. These we need desperately, I do not say to the exclusion of other projects, but urban recreational areas are equally needed with national parks. They must be within access of our major urban areas.

I could go on for quite some time on this subject, as could all hon. members. I conclude by saying the bill envisages a worth-while approach and I commend it to hon. members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Peters: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

**CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—REPORTED
STATEMENT BY OFFICIAL THAT HEAD OFFICE WILL NOT
BE LOCATED IN VANCOUVER**

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about the Canada Development Corporation. As you know, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced the establishment of this corporation in this House he said it would have its head office in Vancouver, British Columbia. When the directors of the Canada Development Corporation were appointed, the federal government expressed the wish that this publicly-funded corporation should have its head office in Vancouver. This was, among other things, to be evidence of Ottawa's interest in western Canada and a determination that the financial importance of western Canada should be upgraded by the government. Now that the two-year deadline is approaching and the CDC claims to have complied with the letter of that undertaking, let us see how things really look.

Item 1. Anthony Hampson, president and chief executive of the CDC, is married. Mrs. Hampson has a good job in Toronto. She has children in school there. It is only natural that family ties might make it difficult for a senior executive to move where his job must take him. But that normally should be a problem for him, not for the city of Vancouver.

Item 2. A Vancouver executive seeking career advancement recently wrote to the CDC concerning employment in the new Vancouver head office. He was told that it was only going to be a small operation and that no staff was being hired.