

and about the needs of each part of the country and the people whom we represent.

I wish to present a different view, not one that is contradictory in any sense of the word because I think those views which have been expressed are valid. None of us here who has travelled to other provinces can deny the beauty that exists in this country from coast to coast right up to the Arctic ocean. I think all of us applaud the efforts of the minister in doing what he has done for national parks in this country. I think that could be said on all sides of the House, and we support him with enthusiasm. More progress has been made in his ministry than in all of our history. We can be grateful to him for that and for his foresight with respect to generations to come.

I represent an urban area, or the fringes of an urban area where recreation is needed, not necessarily tourism. I think that tourism is an important part of it, but we should think in terms of the leisure time that is becoming increasingly available to people. They all want recreation and recreational land so that people today can buy easily a waterfront lot without spending a great deal of money for a place in the country. Because we are a mobile society we have the opportunity to move to all parts of the country, but the person in the city appreciates the country in a different way and in some ways needs it even more than those who are brought up in rural areas. They are confined in the cities, and if we believe in the projections that are given to us, by the end of this century some 70 per cent to 90 per cent of our people will be in urban areas. I do not think that is necessarily a good trend but it may be an inevitable one. The fact is that if it occurs, the need for recreation outside the city will become much greater.

In the province of Ontario we have a range of provincial parks which are doing a most effective job but which cannot meet the demands placed on them. Any time I have a holiday in the summer I spend it way up in Georgian Bay where there is a major provincial park, Kilbare, which is a huge park but which is usually crowded by four or five o'clock on Friday afternoon and filled up for the weekend. A high percentage of the people who take advantage of these parks is made up of Canadians who are not born in this country, who are new to Canada. They appreciate our outdoors and the opportunity they have to enjoy it.

But the people in the cities will increase in number and will require greater chances to spend their leisure time. They will have less opportunity to acquire their own land, if indeed that is desirable, and they will have more opportunity to travel to different parts of the country. So in that sense I welcome the expansion of national parks, not for tourists from other countries but for the recreation and leisure time of present and future generations of Canadians.

When there are people in urban communities who do not have the opportunity or the wherewithal to travel very far in their desire to escape from the pressures of our major urban centres, I think it is necessary for us to create an increasing number of large urban parks or recreation areas, and I welcome and applaud the provision and preservation of a major part of the waterfront in Toronto for recreational purposes. That is one type of park and I think it is one of the most valuable things that has been done by

### *National Parks Act*

a federal government, a new initiative that has been taken that has not even been thought of by previous governments or previous ministers.

The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Basford) is here tonight and I applaud him for his initiative in this respect. However, we will also be in need of recreational lands on the periphery of our cities or within easy access to them, and I suggest that we have some unique opportunities here. However, here we are within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. I think this is an area for co-operation that we should not overlook. To make certain that there are sufficient lands provided is something that has the support of all people.

People today appreciate the need for such facilities. As a matter of fact, part of my constituency has been expropriated for the proposed new airport, and in speaking to the people about land use—some of them are very upset, as you know—and the need for parks, one finds that they say, "If we were expropriated for the purpose of creating a park, we could understand and appreciate it; but the pressures that are being put upon us by the technological society is something to which we object."

There are many areas where we can take initiatives, areas of environmental control where there are major works for the containment of shore erosion, for instance, for the cleaning up of ravines, which should not only be cleaned up and set aside for further development by the municipalities, in conjunction with the provinces and if necessary with the federal government, but should be held and preserved as parkland in these urban areas.

● (2150)

One of the classic examples of the value of an urban national park is the Gatineau national park on the doorstep of Ottawa-Hull. Those of us who spend a great deal of time here have learned a little about that park. On the odd weekend we have been able to go there with our families, and to get out during the winter and ski. We appreciate how great it is having something as beautiful as the Gatineau national park accessible to us.

When we think of airports let us think in terms of Mirabel, where there are about 80,000 acres involved. My guess is that something like 5,000 acres would be adequate for the actual airport facilities, with probably another 15,000 acres necessary for the surrounding noise area. These lands are coming within, or are already within public ownership. Here, again, in trying to preserve the land, because of the noise disruptive zone near an airport we have an opportunity to develop that surrounding area as an urban park for the greater Montreal region.

If we think about it in this way it may not be necessary to dislocate the people living there. There would be no urgency about moving them. There may be urgency to start the project. However, once we commit ourselves to it in this manner we can tell the people that they can stay there for a generation, or indeed that if their children want to stay there for another generation that would not be too bad, but that within a period of one or two generations all this land must revert to the use of the public, particularly for the use of those locked into the city.

If indeed the proposed airport at Pickering does go ahead, again we are talking of something in the area of