

National Parks Act

Mr. Honey: My hon. friend says "right". Perhaps we should look at the record, because that is not what the proposed legislation says. I think if my hon. friend, who is learned in the law, would read the bill or listen to me, he would agree that there is nothing in the powers vested in the corporation which will remove the control of parks policy. This measure goes to some length to ensure that the corporation is at all times under the direct control of the minister and/or the Governor in Council. Let me refer to Clause 18(1) which reads:

The corporation shall comply with any direction from time to time given to it in writing by the Governor in Council or the Minister respecting the carrying out of its objects or the exercise of its powers.

If hon. members had read that Clause, I think they could have only come to one conclusion, that the corporation at all times must comply with the directions and authority of the minister or the Governor in Council. Subclause (2) of Clause 18 says:

The Treasury Board may from time to time for any year establish the percentage of the gross revenues of the corporation for that year that may be extended by the corporation in that year for administration purposes.

That is pretty effective control on the operations of the corporation.

This is a debate on second reading and I do not wish to take the time of the House to refer to various clauses of the bill which make it absolutely and abundantly clear that the corporation is under the control and the direction of the minister and the Governor in Council.

An hon. Member: So is the CBC.

Mr. Honey: These clauses are in the measure and hon. members can read them.

Mr. Forrestal: You better take the word "direction" out of Clause 3, then.

Mr. Honey: I want to deal very briefly with some of the matters raised by hon. members. I will not go into detail because my minister will be before the committee when this matter is being studied there, and will have an opportunity to go into these details. There are three or four matters of rather broad substance with which I should perhaps deal now.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) asked during his first speech on second reading for an assurance in respect of the financing of the corporation. Let me refer

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

the hon. member to Clause 23 of the bill which provides for loans, including loans for working capital, and the aggregate of such loans, which shall not exceed \$20 million. There are other similar provisions in the measure but I shall not refer to them as I do not wish to take up the time of the House on details at this stage of the proceedings.

The hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene), recommended to the minister the establishment of parks in the Yukon and Northwest Territories. He was supported in this suggestion by other hon. members. I think it would be of interest if I said to the House, as most members know, that the minister has publicly stated and actively pursued a policy regarding the very substantial enlargement of the number of national parks in Canada. The minister is proposing new national parks which will be subject to consultation with the territorial governments, and these will include parks in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon.

While I am on this theme, let me say that the minister is indeed hopeful that by the turn of the century, well within 30 years, we may have 60 or 80 new national parks in Canada. We are talking about a very ambitious program which will give an opportunity to future generations of Canadians, referred to so many times during this debate, to enjoy wilderness areas which are part of their heritage. Under this government and this minister, the number of parks will be very substantially increased in years ahead.

The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) took some time to persuade the House that he had been a good minister when he was administering this particular department. That may or may not be correct. In any event, it is not relevant to this particular debate. That seemed to be the theme of his remarks, but he got himself bogged down somewhat in this matter of perpetual leases. In this regard, I have put on the record for hon. members to read, certain Orders in Council which are in existence.

I think it would be helpful in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris if I put on the record some of the documentation in respect of this policy of perpetual leases. In his remarks as recorded at page 3450 of *Hansard* the hon. member for Brandon-Souris made reference to the fact