

National Parks Act

to have even the ghost of a chance of competing for business. Mr. Speaker, the glaring crime of it all is that these people will have no say in the governing of the townsite and no say in the operation of their businesses and services to the public.

Now I want to speak about services to the public. In the province of Alberta tourism is the second largest industry, mainly because of the national parks. In the whole North American continent one cannot find such a picturesque, magnificent drive as that linking the national parks of Banff and Jasper—

Mr. Orange: The Alaska highway.

Mr. Horner: It is a terrific tourist attraction but it is a long way from Calgary and Edmonton, the two major centres at which tourists generally arrive. It is logical that we should have a townsite in Banff and in Jasper in order to give service to the tourists. There is no sense in my going into the question of the effect that the 42-year lease has had on these people. We hear of things "turning on" the younger generation—and some of the older generation, too—but let me tell you that the 42-year lease principle has "turned off" the developers in the national parks. Service has become slack. In the past two summers sometimes as many as 1,500 people could not find lodging in Banff and had to travel 60 or 70 miles to Calgary for the night and drive back to the park the next day.

We have a tremendous asset here, a gift of nature. Why do we cripple ourselves, limit ourselves by bringing in such a socialistic document? A Crown corporation to "manage, maintain and develop"! Somebody suggested that it is a communist document. The socialists in the House did not like it, so it must be something worse. I think it is bad, poor legislation. There is no question in my mind that it will do nothing to develop and encourage the citizens in these townsites to develop and to give better service.

Let us be frank about the question. As we progress in our society today and as town sites and cities become larger, more and more people are looking for playgrounds and a place to relax—for some place to get away from the madding crowd. The national parks of Banff, Jasper, Watertown and others throughout this country have provided this outlet. But we must give service. It amazes me how this government, supposed to be modern, hep and "with it" can think that a Crown corporation

will be flexible enough to develop every nook and cranny in order to provide such relaxation.

How can what the hon. member for Red Deer called a faceless corporation be in tune or even care to be in tune with the demands of the day in giving pleasing service to the public? I find it beyond comprehension how the government could imagine that Crown corporations sitting high and mighty here in Ottawa, and without competition, could even concern themselves as they should with such a vastly growing business as tourism. Tourism is one of Canada's greatest assets, and Alberta is very fortunate to have the Rocky Mountains, or even part of them, in the province. Alberta is fortunate, too, that Banff, Jasper and Watertown were set aside as national parks in the early days. Could a Crown corporation develop services fast enough to meet the demands of the years ahead? Could it be flexible enough? The parliamentary secretary may say, "Yes, it is going to be a new and different Crown corporation". But where are the new and different people coming from—Mars, the moon?

Crown corporations are made up of people, but people who do not face competition. Without somebody harping at them they are likely to become lax and contented. Occasionally they even become conceited and authoritative. They are not likely to bend to the whims of a poor tourist out from the city for the day. No industry in our whole economy must be as flexible as the tourist industry. No industry, whether it be manufacturing, oil or farming must be as prepared to meet the whims of the individual as the tourist industry. How can we believe that a Crown corporation could be that flexible?

● (9:30 p.m.)

It might be argued that the people living in the townsites of Waterton, Banff and Jasper have some say in the management and control of those towns. The bill does not suggest that. They will come under the authority of this so-called National Parks Leasehold Corporation. We see in this bill epitomized the attitude of the government. We see here the government displaying an irresponsible and authoritarian attitude. It disregards the very principles of democratic, responsible government under which the people of the country in towns, counties and provinces have a right to some say as to the way they shall be governed. This bill does not give the people of the townsites that say; one of the basic principles of our democracy has been ignored.