

*National Parks Act*

income generated under their jurisdiction. To put this in a measure of perspective, the wood, pulp and paper industry is the largest source of income for Canada and is the responsibility, in Parliament, of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. The agriculture industry is our second largest source of income and comes within the purview of a full-time minister. Though the fact may be unknown to many, the tourist industry in Canada today represents the third largest source of income to this country. Last year it accounted for more than \$1 billion. Surely, it is worthwhile appointing a full-time minister to help control and develop this great asset instead of turning over so important a sphere to a bureaucratic Crown corporation entirely removed from the responsibilities and obligations of representatives elected to the Canadian Parliament.

A while ago the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) was castigating members on this side of the House for failing to put forward constructive alternatives to what is contained in the bill before us. The proposal I have just made is one which the government should have had under review, because it has been brought to their attention on a number of occasions. In my opinion it is worthy of serious consideration.

I am irrevocably opposed to the whole context and content of Bill C-152.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Before the Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Honey) speaks on the amendment, there are a few observations I should like to make as this long debate draws to a conclusion. I do not wish to prolong it, because most of the points which the opposition wished to make have already been put forward. The length of the debate and the large number of participants indicate, I believe, the general feeling of many members of this House that the bill presented to us is not a good bill and that it should be carefully reconsidered by the government and presented again, with many changes, if it has not been decided to wipe it out entirely.

I am very glad to see that the minister has found it possible to be with us in the House, at least during the later stages of the debate. This removes at least one of the procedural objections we have taken on this side of the House. In addition, I am pleased to learn that since this debate began the rent increases in the national parks of Banff and Jasper have been deferred for a year. If nothing else, it seems at least possible that some of the observations made during this debate have gotten

home to the minister and his officials. I think that is good. Perhaps it shows the value of debate in this House.

I was also glad to hear the minister indicate the other day in reply to a question that the residents of Banff and Jasper will have an opportunity to appear before the committee when this bill reaches the committee. I think this is good. Perhaps we shall all be able to obtain further insight into the problems involved.

These are some of the good things which possibly have resulted from the lengthy discussion in this House. There is one question I should like to put to the minister or to the Parliamentary Secretary before the debate is finally wound up in this chamber. He may prefer to answer it on another occasion, but I think it would be better if it were answered at this point. It is this: does the government at the present time place any restriction on the qualifications of persons to whom Crown land may be sold? I bring this point up because certain clauses of the bill would reduce in size the areas of the national parks, and most members of the House, I think, would like an assurance that the land which is to become surplus will at least be made available to Canadians as a first choice and not turned over to people from other countries.

There is another point I should like to bring up briefly. It concerns the question of the extension of parks. This has been dealt with by a number of my hon. friends and I do not propose to be repetitious. For a number of years since I have been a member of this House I have placed private bills and resolutions on the Order Paper suggesting that the Government of Canada take over an area in Ontario known as Long Point, as a national park. This is a long, sandy island in Lake Erie. I have suggested this very sincerely on many occasions over the last 16 years. I must say that if this bill goes through I most certainly would not continue to recommend any such action. I would rather hope that the Province of Ontario will eventually take over this area as a park and administer it. If the administration of our parks, policy-making and everything else, is to be taken over by a Crown corporation I certainly would not want to see this happening in my own province.

• (4:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Chrétien:** You have not read the bill. That is not what we are proposing.