

Adjournment Motion

exchange was at the heart of the proposal. An exchange was suggested by Parks Canada officials because of their wish to avoid having higher density development on the original land held by the developer.

Mr. Kempling: Garbage.

Mr. Peterson: Third, the Hon. Member has said that no environmental assessment was done. With respect, that is not true. An assessment was conducted in December, 1981 and certain of the resulting proposals and recommendations were incorporated in the conditions attaching to the building permit.

Fourth, it has been alleged that the matter was kept secret for two years before people found out about it, at the last moment. Quite apart from the fact that the zoning has been a matter of public knowledge for ten years, we have the minutes of the Banff Advisory Council, which are a matter of public record, which show repeated reference to the progress of this development proposal. The charge of secrecy is therefore unwarranted.

The fifth charge is that the permit was hastily issued. The permit was not rushed. It was not issued until the developer

had fulfilled all the requirements which are normal under the circumstances. This developer was treated no differently from any other. I would like to say, as the Minister has repeatedly stated in the House, that the approval process in this case followed its normal course and Parks Canada officials were satisfied that the development, which will provide badly needed housing, meets the interests of Parks Canada and the residents of Banff.

This has not been a battle of bulldozers and chain saws against the ecology and the people. It has been a matter seized upon for the narrow purpose of attempting to exacerbate partisan emotion and to make petty political gain.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock p.m.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.
