

● (1630)

On the other side of the coin, we come to the matter of recreation itself. As I said before, I think recreation should be spontaneous. It is almost like charity: it should begin at home. I think that recreation should not only be physical recreation or outdoor recreation but should also include the mind and the emotions. I am not so sure that lack of physical exercise has been as important a component in the mortality of Canadians as has emotional illness due to lack of sensible recreation. I think that most people work too hard, probably drink too hard, and play too hard. Everything they do is with a strong drive; many people never know how to relax.

I am sure there is more heart disease and gastrointestinal disease, such as ulcers, caused by emotional disturbances—this twentieth century syndrome—than by lack of exercise. I can think of people like my grandparents, who both lived to be 85 or 90 and yet they had no set way of exercising. They were farmers and they worked until they could not work any more. But they rather enjoyed it and they had a lot of fun in between their chores. I think it is important that recreation of an emotional nature go hand in hand with recreation of a physical nature. I am not too sure that all the joggers are still jogging.

On the other hand, I think it is important to realize what was brought out by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). It is by no means something we should throw aside. The value of land management and of our parks, municipal, provincial and federal, cannot be exaggerated. In my city of Welland we are pretty proud of the fact that we have 17 municipal parks. One is known as the Rose City simply because there are some people who are very fond of gardens. Parks should not only have swings, pools and baseball diamonds: I think they should contain, also, a great many quiet and beautiful walks and gardens with flowers and shrubs, because we need the beauty for our souls as much as we need physical exercise.

We have plans also, if we ever get our government to come to a proper conclusion for the city of Welland, to border the three miles on the north side and the three miles on the south side of the old canal with parks and recreational areas. It will probably be one of the most fortunate cities in Canada if this is done, because it had to go through the disruption and misery of a huge construction project when the bypass was built. It took from 1966 until the present year to complete it. Please forgive me for that reference to my own riding, Mr. Speaker. However, what is important about parks is that Canada has a great many of them and they are being used all the time. I will never forget the great recreational and physical enjoyment—I say that with tongue in cheek—of going through Algonquin park with my family many years ago, carrying two waterlogged canoes and a great deal of equipment. I am sure this was for my benefit, but if I had had heart disease I am sure it would have got me then.

The other point I should like to make about parks is that although they are wonderful for canoeists and for people who like outdoor recreation, in fact they are being used by a great many Canadians. The hon. member for Wetaskiwin told us how many people are using the parks; the figure is in the millions. But let us not forget that apart from the 30 per cent of Canadians who use them, there are 200 million

National Recreation Policy

people from south of the border who use these parks and are glad to use them because both in our summers and in our winters they can be used for recreation by the Americans as well as by our own people.

The reasons put forward by the hon. member who put forward the motion for the desirability of parks were very good; however, the only thing I would question is the practicability of creating a national policy to cover recreation. I do not see how we can help using all the departments of the government for everything from agriculture to urban affairs—but is there any way in the world in which we can separate all the aspects of this motion and put them under one ministry? It would be much too chaotic if we did so.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to add that it was very good of the sponsor to bring in this motion. It makes us all think. However, I do not think that a national parks policy for recreation is practical at the present time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in my view the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) has placed before the House a good idea. With reference to some of the things just said by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton), I think I could point out that the mover of this motion does not ask that we be programmed to death, that we all find our recreational outlets in the same way. But having in mind the increased importance of what we do with our leisure time and the importance of our resources being made available to meet the need of people of all ages, I think a motion such as this should be passed.

I am the third speaker, and with some reservations on the part of the second speaker we all seem in agreement with the motion before us. So why do we have to indulge in this Friday afternoon recreation of talking the motion out? Why do we not just admit that it is a good idea and that the House would like to express itself in favour of the motion, and let it pass.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Cullen: It is always a pleasure to follow the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I remember that in the last parliament we had many good debates during private members' hour. I think the presence of the hon. member lends a certain amount of prestige to this hour, which I feel is an important hour in the week. Where we do not share the same point of view is that the hon. member in every other debate seems to be quite prepared to talk on and on and have the debate well and fully heard, yet each time he comes into private members' hour we find him trying to limit the time of debate before members who want to speak on important motions have had an opportunity to rise and put their views on the record.

I might say to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) that I heard him on the radio this morning, and I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to cross-examine him on some of the views he was presenting. I think he