

say in this respect that their attitude is in no way unique. It is becoming an almost invariable habit with them to represent themselves as being without any opinion on any question that comes up and, as it were, waiting for instructions. Now, I venture the opinion that this country cannot set its face definitely for any length of time against the development of practical power sites in our parks. I do not think that can be done. If you have a big city with aspirations for industrial progress, and hungering for power as Calgary will be, though it may not be just yet, it certainly is assuming a great deal to stand a thousand miles away and to say, "Do not harness the power at Spray lakes because I and many others might like to look at the water falling down there. You should be good enough to do without the very life blood of industry in order that we may have that pleasure." I can recall years ago when the question of Niagara development was under review, not in this parliament but in Canada. At that time Canadian and American magazines were filled with protests, with splendidly written articles, and with all sorts of violent protests against the idea of commercializing this wonderful beauty spot of nature. Imagine the folly that would have been perpetrated had these words been heeded! Just think of the suggestion of denying to the people of Ontario the comforts as well as the wealth which Niagara development has yielded, in order that some tourists might be able to see more water flowing at a single spot over a hill. Perhaps it is not the same as respects the Spray lakes which are in a natural park. Nevertheless, though perhaps in a lighter degree, the argument applies. There is no province in Canada, unless it be Saskatchewan, which has less natural potential water-power than Alberta; and in that state of the province I do not believe that any government in the world can deny the claims of the people to utilize such powers as they have. Nor is it essential, I should think, that there should be any gross disfigurement of the natural beauty of the park as the result of power development. I know there could be.

Mr. MURPHY: They get over that difficulty in Italy and Switzerland and they have great power development.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the Postmaster General has been good enough to interject is quite true. By the exercise of careful supervision, power development can be made quite presentable, and if I were in the Banff national park, I would prefer to see there some well executed, splendidly finished engineering feat

that had the purpose of giving to mankind the benefit of a great national asset, to having the mere, crude pleasure of watching the spray at a great height. Consequently, in so far as my advice is of any value to the minister, I would say: Just as soon as he is convinced that there is real use to be made of this power site; that it is really needed, then, subject to proper restrictions, subject to proper supervision, the power should be thrown open. I do not say it should be thrown open to the Calgary Power Company necessarily. It might be the part of wisdom to assign it to the province of Alberta, but I never would assume a dog-in-the-manger policy, and with an affectation for the beautiful in nature, presume to deny to our fellow-beings the use of a great natural possession and resource of Canada.

Mr. SHAW: Certainly one cannot resist the clear-sighted and logical policy enunciated by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Meighen). I am sure if he saw some of the snapshots of that area, some of which I have under my hand, he would agree with me immediately that the area has not any very special significance as regards scenic value.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hear, hear.

Mr. SHAW: The hon. member for Bow River says, "hear, hear." He visited that area last year and saw it for himself. That particular variety of scenery can be duplicated in a thousand different places. The parks in Alberta total an area of approximately 9,000 square miles, and all of this, if advocates of park conservation are to have their way, is to be forever a closed area in which there shall be no commercial exploitation at all. Some advocates of park conservation or preservation agree with the view that the parks in Alberta are altogether too large. The present park area should be carefully surveyed so as to pick out the points of special scenic significance, and the rest should be permitted to be commercialized where commercialization is proper and justified. With what the leader of the opposition says in regard to a proper development especially of this particular area, I find myself in accord. I happen to have a copy of the Manchester Guardian Weekly of Friday, April 17, of this year, and apparently there has been from time to time a great deal of controversy even in England with regard to the preservation of what might be called mountain reservoirs. I desire to read from this article one or two selections which will epitomize the situation: