

have a very hard time to understand this thing. They wonder where the trouble has come from. Frankly, I am one of those. I would like a few comments from Mr. Côté on why this is really necessary. I do not see any need for that type of take over because the lease is controlled, in my opinion, day by day, and it does not necessarily have any real period at all; but when you tell someone that at the end of the lease his property will be taken and paid for, this causes a lot of trouble. Now, if they are not matching park policy, as I said earlier, the lease is controlled day by day and any day that they refuse to comply with government policy or park policy their lease can be terminated. Why was this instituted? Frankly, I am one of those who cannot see any real need for it or even any good reason for it.

Mr. CÔTÉ: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said that at the end of leases there had been in the past, generally, representations made that it would be very wrong to terminate the lease. You have people who have been there 42 years who would say: "You are taking my building away from me. You are taking my land away from me". I think there has been a general lack of appreciation precisely that this was a leasehold.

In the cities it is generally understood in commercial and residential practice, that you lease a plot of land and you build on it, but the holder of the land is the owner of the building. Provided that you comply with the terms of the lease you have enjoyment of what you put on this property until the end of the lease. At the termination of that lease all improvements to the land revert to the landlord. The public generally may not have understood that representations would be made regularly at the end of the lease. It is a pretty harsh thing; you get a renewal, another renewal, and from one generation to the other, people gradually get the idea that the building, the leasehold, is something that belongs to them and not to the landlord. It was a decision which was, as I have indicated earlier, one that had begun, so far as the so-called "perpetual" leases are concerned, in 1958.

● (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. GUNDLOCK: Excuse me for interrupting, Mr. Chairman, I see this. I appreciate this, although it is not all that important. For instance, if I lease a farm, I can put certain buildings on it. I can put improvements on the farm that revert to me at the end of the lease.

Mr. CÔTÉ: Is it included in the lease?

Mr. GUNDLOCK: Well, the law does not go that far even in private property. But I do not want to get into that argument. At the end of these leases you are saying that if the people have not perpetual hold—you are going to take over their property. What are you going to do; are you going to give it to someone else?

This is the question in my mind: Why terminate that holder's lease? He sells it, he maybe wills it; it changes hands. I am familiar with Waterton. Those leases change hands; businesses are sold. Does the park want to own the whole thing or what?

Mr. CÔTÉ: There is a limit, sir, to the extent to which townsites can develop inside a park. The principle, it seems to the department and to the government,