

National Parks Act

is able to come before the House of Commons with his departmental estimates to get some well-deserved answers to questions. I think the minister's statement, as reported in the press a few months ago, "If you don't like it, you can move out", was the kind of statement that deserves a seat in the other place.

Yesterday, and indeed the last time this debate took place, many references were made to the 42-year leases. I remember when this issue was raised in this House ten or 11 years ago and was discussed at length on a number of occasions. Members, particularly those from western Canada, raised a number of objections to the legislation at that time and appeared to be stymied by the wishes of the bureaucracy. I did not support the 42-year lease proposal at that time and I still maintain that leases should be granted in perpetuity if architectural standards are to be insisted upon. Indeed, architectural standards are being set by the department. If they are prepared to interfere in the administration of the parks to that extent, then surely the man who is putting up the money should be able to enjoy a long term lease. Surely, there is nothing to fear from leases in perpetuity. Legislative provision could be made whereby these leases, no matter of what length, could be broken on breach of a regulation, if such breach were of a serious nature. There is very little to be concerned about there.

I heard considerable argument about the 1959 Order in Council, No. 1108. One would admit, and I suppose it is true, that increases in rentals at that time were considered and were indeed authorized. But the fact of the matter is that it was the responsibility of this government to either act upon that Order in Council or repeal it. They had the alternatives; it was their prerogative and they chose to act on it. They avoided the real issue by simply saying it was the Conservatives who brought in the measure in 1959, which was an absolute falsehood. The responsibility lies with this government, and they are the ones who are imposing the penalty on the parks at this time.

In view of the publicity aroused by Bill C-152, I suggest it might be wise for the government to consider municipal status for the townsites of Banff and Jasper, as well as towns in some of the other major parks in this country. The federal government could retain, if they wished, the responsibility for maintenance of the wilderness areas. I am not too sure in my own mind but that justice could best be served by having the minister

sell the parks back to the provinces for a fee of \$1.

I am concerned about the setting up of a Crown corporation because, as the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) said, what is there to worry about? At this stage of the game, not very much. However, the people presently working in the department are concerned because once this department becomes a Crown corporation the responsibility for its administration is in the hands of the president and his staff. As members of Parliament, we can ask questions on the operation of that department but we do not get any more satisfactory answers than we do from the Department of Public Works or the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Who appoints the people who are going to administer the Crown corporation and how are they to be appointed? Will the minister appoint a sacred few to manage the corporation or is this going to be another freak of Liberal architecture? Once created, is the Crown corporation going to release all of the civil servants presently connected with that department and hire a new group of people to run it, and hire them only if they conform?

I am concerned with what the future leasing procedures might be and how they would be followed. The hon. member for York East elaborated somewhat on that but he did not outline the procedures. I should like to know whether the procedure will be a continuation of public tendering for sites. Are these leases going to be granted by an appointed officer of the corporation itself or by an officer of the government? I think the minister should answer some of these questions before the bill is passed.

Again, I ask the minister what is so fair about arbitrary rental increases without prior notice or consultation? I am sure the minister, just as I and many other members of this House, has received letters, telephone calls, telegrams and what not, to an extent that causes us great concern. The well established businesses can afford to pay the tariff imposed by the government at this point, but a good many new ventures in all the parks have limited finances and face the prospect of bankruptcy. I do not think even the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Sulatycky) would support that kind of arbitrary governmental action.

• (4:20 p.m.)

May I ask the minister why the staffs in the parks were reduced? The explanation no doubt