

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

tions of the land use code. On checking into the matter I find that in the allocation of this particular property for a motel we are following the Oberlander report completely, and in addition we are following the advice of the body involved in respect of the zoning plans. So I cannot understand how they can be so ill-informed, that I shall be very careful about taking any advice from them in the future.

As I understand the minister's position, he has now agreed to meet this democratic organization; but he does not want to meet those people who made that suggestion—he will only meet part of the body. This is a ridiculous position to be in. I say to the minister that if he is going to meet this elected body, whether he likes them or not he should meet with them because they are an elected body in Banff. What is the problem? I mentioned the point about our great land developer and the syndicate. I refer to Mayor Hawrelak, mayor of Edmonton. There is no doubt about it, that because of relatives of his who are behind this particular man, he is behind the promotion in question.

What are they doing? They are agreeing, contrary to the recommendations of the interim development board and contrary to the advisory council, to build a motel in one of the best residential sections of Banff. I say this is contrary to the spirit of the National Parks Act, which is really to preserve the parks in their natural and national beauty. I put this to the minister first of all; I ask him to check tonight—and I am most serious about this—order in council No. 1,149 of 1956. I see the minister making a note of this. He will find this order in council most interesting. It zoned this area for residential purposes, or as a dual residential area, and is against the building of a motel or hotel in this area. This is one of the most beautiful spots in Banff national park; second, it is in the best residential area of those people who are serving the tourists. I say that the development in question is against the law and I would ask the minister to check into this question very carefully.

Mr. Nielsen: Wasn't Hawrelak going to be a cabinet minister?

Mr. Woolliams: He was, but Mr. Justice Porter, who has great vision and is one of the better members of the judiciary, unseated him in another capacity. But I do not want to be sidetracked. The minister, in approving this development, is in breach of the spirit of the National Parks Act and the Oberlander report. I ask the minister to look at pages 48 to 52 of the Oberlander report. He says that in fact this is not against the

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Oberlander report. First of all I would point out that it is against an order in council, and if there is a zoning bylaw contained in an order in council passed by the former Liberal government, I do not know how the minister can usurp that law.

I say that although there is a chart showing this area as a parking area and possibly a motel area, it is because there is a motel behind the area and it is not really zoned for motels. Page 48 of the Oberlander report recommends that this area be kept in its present state, in its beautiful residential state, but particularly in its beautiful state. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say there is something behind this plan. I would not make this charge against the minister because I am not that kind of fellow, but the advisory council did suggest there is something bad in this connection, that something smells in the state of Denmark, or there is some patronage. I am not saying this to the minister, but I am saying that there is so much area in the townsite of Banff and so much area in the whole of the national park, which is as big as the province of Prince Edward Island, that they could build this motel in a place other than that approved by the minister, which is contrary to the recommendations of the interim development board. On the board are two of the top officials, Mr. Strong and Mr. Dempster. When you have had a submission from a democratic organization and from the people of Banff which is contrary to the law then there is something wrong.

I am not going to discuss tonight the elected body in Banff. They are a body which demanded your resignation, sir, because they said this was patronage and that there was a pay-off. I do not know about that but I do say, let us be reasonable. They are tearing down an old building in that particular spot now. Let us leave it in its natural state. There are lots of other areas in the townsite of Banff. Why can there not be a trade or a compromise where even this great land developer of ours can build? The last time he made half a million dollars out of a similar project.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think the question addressed to me by the hon. member is divided into two parts. The first is: Am I now prepared to meet the advisory committee? Under date October 9 I wrote them and I do not think I could do