

*National Parks Act*

development fund to the minister. Another clause requires the minister to report to the Governor in Council on the operation of the fund. But there is no clause requiring that any report on the fund be made to this House. Neither is there a requirement that a general report on the over-all operation of the corporation be made to anybody, including the minister.

This may be an oversight in drafting. I hope that it is, and that the minister will make some proposals in this regard at the committee stage. As I say, it is bad enough that Crown corporations run their own affairs; but when we get to the stage where even theoretically they do not have to report to anybody, then we have reached a pretty pass. Unless the minister makes appropriate modifications to the bill or explains the situation, I am afraid that I and my colleagues will have to continue to oppose this bill.

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said a moment ago, this has been a long debate. I think this is the sixth day of the second reading stage. On five of those days, we took a very substantial part of the day; last night we had only about half an hour's debate. I do not know how helpful this debate has been, and I am sure that the remarks of hon. members in this chamber have not always been relevant to the bill. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) made that point this afternoon.

In my remarks I should like to make reference to the contentions put forward by members of the opposition and clear up some of them. There are two or three main ones, and with respect I think they are more misconceptions. Either hon. members have not carefully read the bill, or they have not understood what they read.

● (5:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Oxford and other members referred to the multitude of statements which might very loosely be interpreted as suggesting that the Crown corporation will have full responsibility for the administration of the parks. Of course that is utter nonsense. The legislation does not say that in any respect. Hon. members across the way, including my friend the hon. member for Oxford, who is the critic for the official opposition, and hon. members like the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert),

who is generally reputed to be an authority on this subject of parks because he is from an area in proximity to western parks, complained in the first instance about the broad and strong powers that we intend to give to this corporation through this legislation. In the next breath, these members suggest that this would be an autocratic and overriding corporation which would have no respect for the people in the parks or park authority. In yet the next breath the hon. member for Edmonton West said, and I made the specific note of his words, this would be such a body that it would become a stooge for the minister and the government.

I had some difficulty in accepting with any degree of seriousness this group of criticisms which I put down, under the heading of the corporation, full responsibility for administration of parks. Other members repeated this sort of argument. As I said, that is utter nonsense. That is not the case at all if you read the bill, and this is obvious and apparent to you, Mr. Speaker, as well as to other hon. members of the House.

Let me refer to Clause 15(1) of this bill which reads:

The objects of the corporation are to develop, manage and maintain, on a basis that is economically sound and consistent with the purposes for which the National Parks are dedicated, property in the Parks the direction of the administration, management and control of which is entrusted to.

That confines all this under the heading of objects, powers and responsibilities of the corporation to the administration of property in the Parks.

The second contention and, I think, misconception, I should like to deal with—there have been many speakers opposite who have referred to this—is what I might group generally under the heading of the creation of a corporation which will remove control from the hands of the minister. Many hon. members have made this statement. I made note of the words of the hon. member for Oxford because he is the critic of the official opposition on this matter. In his first speech he said that the corporation could do what it liked with leases, and that this would virtually take the control of national parks out of the hands of the government.

Latterly, in the speech he just concluded, my hon. friend said that the Crown corporation will make de facto policy in respect of national parks.

**Mr. Nesbitt: Right.**