

Mr. Speaker, these grievances were examined through the usual procedure and French-speaking classification officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare inquired, together with officers of the Department of National Defence.

The organization and classification of employees in Quebec and Toronto working for the family allowance branch in Quebec City are the same and, accordingly, the grievances presented were rejected.

[English]

NATIONAL PARKS—SHIP HARBOUR—PREVENTION OF
LAND SPECULATION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to thank the minister for having stayed this evening. The issue I wish to bring forward arises from two brief questions I put to him, as reported in *Hansard* on April 21 on page 5122, having to do with reports and suggestions which are reaching my office in considerable numbers expressing concern and alarm over what appears to be land speculation in connection with a proposed park at Ship Harbour.

My purpose in being here tonight is to illicit certain information from the minister, not necessarily to emphasize the aspect I have just mentioned. I am sure that if there is anything of that nature going on, the minister and the federal authority will take steps accordingly, even though at this stage it would not be a matter of particular concern to them directly but one of indirect concern.

I should like to ask the hon. gentleman one or two simple questions. The answers to them, or the reaction to them, would go a long way toward bringing to an end the concern which arises when people are not kept advised of a situation. The first question is this: Why has there not been any form of communication with the public in the area concerned, in a public way, for more than a year? About a year ago the citizens of the area became sufficiently concerned to cause a public meeting to be held. Certain public officials attended that meeting and as a result a good deal of misunderstanding was cleared up. A year has now gone by and no attempt has been made to repeat this process.

My second question arises from the general vagueness which seems to surround the question of a third national park in Nova Scotia. There has been a clear indication in correspondence and from the provincial authorities that there will indeed be a third park in the province and that planning is in progress, but as yet there has been no public announcement by the minister to the effect that the federal authority has decided to go ahead. I think the minister should first call a meeting and, second, inform us whether it is intended to provide a park. He should have the common sense to tell the people in the area concerned what the boundaries are to be. This is the only

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

way in which it is possible to establish a park with minimum disruption to the people directly concerned and with minimum benefit to those who might use information, possibly coming from provincial offices, for their own advantage. This could put them in the position where they would go around the countryside buying up land they knew, or had reason to believe, the provincial government might buy for the purpose of developing a park. Some indication from the minister about these three very brief points would be very welcome.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this debate but I am afraid I cannot help him very much. We are embarking upon a very aggressive campaign to establish more national parks in Canada. In 2½ years we have succeeded in establishing six new national parks, compared with only four in the previous four years.

It is true that we are negotiating with the government of the province of Nova Scotia in respect of a national park there. Those who want to speculate can do so, because we do not know yet where the third national park will be if one is agreed upon. The hon. member will realize there are other factors to be kept in mind. We are receiving proposals from all parts of Nova Scotia, and Ship Harbour is one of the possibilities. We have not come to terms with the administration about the second national park in Nova Scotia, so we do not know where it will be situated.

There are all sorts of factors involved in any purchase from the province by the federal administration. We have to decide on the kind of park it should be, and so on. There will be a national park in Nova Scotia because we have to preserve some of the land along the coast. I understand that much of this land is being purchased by Americans and I think it is our duty to put some aside for future generations. I should like to see a third national park in Nova Scotia, but I cannot speculate about it as we have not yet come to terms. Perhaps the people who are purchasing this land will hold on to it. We are not advising anyone to buy this land right now, because they could turn out to be losers.

I indicated to the hon. member that I would convey his remarks to the provincial administration which controls the land, and this is in the process of being done. I thank the hon. member for raising this matter. I hope we will have a third national park in Nova Scotia, but I cannot say it will be at Ship Harbour or anywhere else. Nova Scotia is a very beautiful province and many places could be used for national parks.

Mr. Bell: Don't forget New Brunswick.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.