

national parks, and when the provincial government offers to take part in the first large scale investigation of the requirements for recreation on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains and takes the unprecedented step of offering the government of Canada an opportunity to have a member sit on that panel, the government refuses to accept it. I suggest that national parks are far too important a matter to leave to bureaucrats. It is time to ease out the consultants and let in the people; to end the secrecy and to encourage public discussion about the best way to meet our recreational needs and the need of later generations for unspoiled nature.

Parks are a public trust, not a private trust of a particular bureaucracy. In preparing these remarks, I assumed that parliament would have the fundamental right to control the expenditures of government by voting on the estimates. I was concerned that the minister or his spokesman might reply in such a way as to imply a kind of blackmail that would intimidate me or other members of the House from making the points we believe have to be made by suggesting that certain necessary appropriations would be taken from our constituencies or areas that have obvious national needs. If we had been able to vote on our notice of opposition to limit some vital service, there is no question at all that funds for these services could have been found from other sources within the department. It would not have been the first time that this government has engaged in lateral bookkeeping. If money or services had been taken from the townsites of Banff and Jasper, which I represent, that would simply serve to illustrate the highly unsatisfactory nature of a situation where a government can, by a whim, eliminate services that in any other community are essential.

If that argument were used, it would simply demonstrate the need to move quickly to improve the capacity for self-government and for some kind of authority to impose taxation to maintain these communities within the national parks. The day is over when one department can shut out people and provinces from decisions which vitally affect each one. When we vote tonight, as we are forced to do because of the President of the Privy Council and because of our rules, to support the full appropriation, I suggest that we will be also supporting the kind of arrogance which tells concerned citizens that "there is a road east and a road west", the kind of thoughtlessness which proposes to arbitrarily terminate fishing rights or take away fishermen's homes—rights that have existed for generations—the kind of ostrich planning which declines an invitation to sit on the board at public hearings regarding the use of regions dominated by national parks. It will encourage this and subsequent governments to believe that they can go on without parliamentary scrutiny, violating the rights of individuals, ignoring the traditions of the country, and developing the new and dangerous tradition that parliament will give any departmental estimates automatic passage.

I am afraid that that is the situation in which we find ourselves tonight because of the decision that has been taken for partisan reasons by the President of the Privy Council to save his hide and that of the government. I regret that we will not have an opportunity to bring this matter to a vote. I am glad, as the hon. member for Yukon said, that we retain, at least in the House, the opportunity

Estimates

to speak even if we do not, because to the machinations of the President of the Privy Council, have the capacity to control the government as parliament in ancient times was created to do.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise today. I do not want to give advice to the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), but may I point out that rather than give hell to the President of the Privy Council today he should have been on his knees thanking him for the action he has taken, because if the hon. member had realized how foolish the motion of the hon. member for Yukon was, he would have been the first one to do that. When he is asking for the right to deny us the \$1,500,000 in Vote 70, he should look into the vote and realize that half of this money is going into western Canada and that most of it is going into his own riding. If we were to vote in favour of that motion tonight, tomorrow morning the first thing I would have to do would be to eliminate the protection of the beautiful forests in Banff and Jasper, because we have a contract with the government of Alberta to protect the forests there. If we were to vote for that motion tonight, tomorrow morning I would be obliged to close down all the campsites in Banff and Jasper.

An hon. Member: Give them a LIP grant.

Mr. Chrétien: We would be in a situation where we would have to deny access to this park to half a million visitors this summer. If we were to vote for this motion, we would have to deny food and shelter to the 290 people with whom we have a contract to work in the backwoods of the parks to protect the environment. When you are 100 miles into the forest you cannot go for lunch to a restaurant, so we have to provide them with food and we do this through a professional contractor. This would mean the closing of the operation. If we were to vote for the motion, we would be obliged tomorrow to fire the 200 veterans who work in the historic parks, and the protection staff who are under contract with my department as members of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires. I can go on and on. I am trying to describe in a few minutes how this procedure would create a real mess for the hon. member and for his constituency of Rocky Mountain. If we were to vote for this motion tonight, I would be obliged to close down Banff and Jasper tomorrow. How irresponsible can those guys be!

When I came here today I thought the hon. member for Rocky Mountain would ask the hon. member for Yukon to please not put his motion. Yet, he was the first member to say to the President of the Privy Council that he was making a fool of himself. Instead, he should thank the President of the Privy Council for having saved the neck of the hon. member for Rocky Mountain.

The hon. member claims we have not put out enough information and that there are not enough public hearings. For the first time in the history of the national parks in Canada, in 1969 we started a program establishing public hearings all over Canada regarding the future development of national parks. We had piles of information to distribute to any people who wanted to participate, not only to the people of Banff but the people of Alberta, and they asked me for a specific public hearing on the develop-