

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

better than read at this time a portion of this letter:

In my opinion the improvement to the Bow View Lodge site was entirely necessary to add to the range of accommodation available in the Banff townsite.

Until this episode I have valued the advice of the Banff advisory council and my good relationship with its members. In national park development the advice of those whose income is derived from the parks is naturally to be valued. It is also necessary to take the advice of those who seek the enjoyment of the national parks as visitors and as part of the Canadian public. The balancing of these interests is never an easy task and it is made more difficult where conclusion drawing appears to be based on suspicion and supposition.

It is a matter of the deepest regret to me that statements have been attributed to certain members of the council charging me or my officials with decisions motivated for reasons of patronage, or I believe the word used was "pay off". Such statements are absolutely untrue and beneath contempt. If the members of council have any doubt then I invite them to take the necessary legal proceedings to have the matter determined. In the alternative I request council to repudiate such allegations and any members of council responsible for them.

I have always been willing to speak to or meet with the Banff advisory council or any of the members when meetings could reasonably be arranged. On Monday, October 5, you were approached by an official of my department in Banff with the advice that I would be prepared to meet the Banff advisory council during the afternoon of Saturday, October 24, in Calgary, at which day I would be visiting that city. I am advised that in reply you stated that the council would not be in a position to decide until October 19 whether it would meet with me. If this attitude of yourself is not correctly reported, then I would be obliged to have your statement.

I am still prepared to see the members of the Banff advisory council in Calgary on the afternoon of October 24 but so far as I am concerned it will be the last meeting which I hold with the present or any future Banff advisory council until I have received their decision on my request from council concerning its collective responsibility for the statements alleging political patronage and "pay off" which I have mentioned.

I trust that my position is now clear and I look forward to having your response in due course.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Would you answer the question, please?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Laing:** Let me deal with the second question. The hon. member has suggested that Mayor Hawrelak of Edmonton is a participant in this project. I have no knowledge whether he is or is not. I would suggest to the hon. member that were he inquisitive enough he would probably have had a better opportunity than I to know. This lease was purchased in the days when he was supporting a government which sat on the treasury benches over here.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Has it not been assigned since? Let us be fair about it.

**Mr. Laing:** I know nothing of an assignment at all.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Then do not make statements like that if you do not know.

**Mr. Laing:** In respect of Mayor Hawrelak I would say this.

**Mr. Woolliams:** He will be in the cabinet soon, I know.

**Mr. Laing:** Mr. Speaker, I should like a little extra time in view of the interruptions.

I want to tell my hon. friend this. If an application were made to us for a building in Banff the determination would not be made by us depending on whether Mr. Hawrelak were an applicant or not. I was approached by Mr. Hawrelak last year, in association with a number of other gentlemen, in connection with a project in Banff which we turned down, and that is all I know about him in Banff. Whether he is associated with this project or not I do not know. I am not interested in the general attempt of my hon. friend to use the tar brush around the edges. Projects put before us will be dealt with on their merits and will have no relationship to the individuals who make application.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The minister's time has expired.

TRANSPORTATION—QUEBEC—PROPOSED REDUCTION IN C.P.R. TRAIN SERVICE

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize for keeping you late tonight, but I believe that this matter is worthwhile.

On Friday last I asked the following question:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Transport but, in his absence, I shall put it to the acting minister.

Could the minister ask the board of transport commissioners to intervene without delay with the C.P.R. and have the company reconsider its decision to cut to three trains per week its service between Montreal and Mont Laurier and to operate fewer trains between Ottawa and Montreal, on the north shore of the Ottawa river, that is on the Quebec side?

Such a change will be highly prejudicial to workers, students and business people in general.

Second, could the minister not convince the government that it would be better to give a grant to the C.P.R., if necessary, so as not to imperil any further the economy of my riding which is already considered as a designated area?