

National Parks Act

the problems and try realistically to adjust the facilities to maximize the opportunities, so that the parks will fill the need and contribute to the tourist industry while providing meaningful recreation. I hope that the facilities presently available will be maintained for the people of Canada as a whole and for the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to add a few remarks to this debate. The hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) spoke earlier today—one of his few contributions in the House of Commons. Most of his speech consisted of a vitriolic attack on the official opposition. I am concerned about this, because his attitude characterizes and epitomizes the attitude of this government not only toward the official opposition but toward Parliament itself.

I wish to speak frankly about his comments in relation to the bill, though I have difficulty in seeing the relationship between the bill and his comments. His speech sounded as though it was written by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) because it was as constructive as are the minister's speeches. I used to think that the hon. member had at heart the best interests of the Canadians who live inside and outside the parks, but his performance this afternoon was unconvincing and irrelevant; his remarks were contradictory and self-defeating; he vacillated between one point of view and another and at times they were bordering on the incoherent.

An hon. Member: That is an expert opinion.

Mr. Yewchuk: He complained that the opposition was not constructive and made no contribution to Parliament. After he spoke, Parliament was no wiser about where he stood on Bill C-152, nor did the quality of debate improve. As a matter of fact, we know less about where he stands than we did before he spoke. The hon. member, as did some of his colleagues, complained of the poor opposition offered by our party. I should like to say that if the government continues on the course it has started, it will have its chance to do better—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I assume the hon. member's remarks are of an introductory nature and that he will finally bring them to bear on the bill before us. I would invite the

hon. member to note that before the House at the present time is Bill C-152, an act to amend the National Parks Act.

Mr. Yewchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought these remarks were relevant since they were in response to a speech which was allowed to continue along that line. My remarks are of an introductory nature and I assure Your Honour that I will soon be on the substance of the bill. However, I wanted to make one or two comments on the hon. member's speech. I realize it was not very interesting, but I will get to the bill in a moment or so.

The whole attitude of the hon. member was a bit upsetting to me, and that is why I wanted to make these comments. He complained about our front benchers not contributing much to the debate and not making good speeches. At least they were here when he was speaking, but on his side only the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) was present. Even the minister responsible for the bill was not in the House, nor has he been here throughout the debate.

In spite of what the hon. member for Calgary South said, I am convinced that my party, the official opposition, is following the right course in opposing the principle of this bill. First, I point out to the country and the House that we are disturbed at the proliferation of Crown corporations instigated by this government, and second, with the callous disregard that this government has for the people of Canada.

I wonder whether there was any consultation with the provinces before this bill was drawn up, in order to ascertain their views on the establishment of this Crown corporation as well as the others that are coming up? Does this government really think it has sought a national consensus on the principle of Crown corporations having so much power and administering such a large segment of our life? This is what we are trying to achieve, Mr. Speaker; but the debate has not lasted long enough for public opinion to develop adequately. It is totally irresponsible of this government to try to ram the bill through the House before public opinion is given a chance to develop.

A very vital question is involved in this debate, that is, what kind of administration do Canadians want? Traditionally, we have thought of ourselves as living in a democracy, a democratic society with the government responsible to Parliament. Since this government came into power a year and a half ago