

*Proposed National Park*

tion with the Premier of my province, should initiate a park in northern Manitoba.

• (1740)

I am surprised the Premier would not wish to accept the offer of the federal government to establish a national park. He said he could do this just as well as the federal government. If it were done by the federal government, the saving to the people of Manitoba would be very great indeed, bearing in mind that the federal government would be responsible for looking after the area, beautifying it and making it a place that not only this generation but our children could enjoy. I hope the Premier, whom I admire, will reconsider his position.

**Mr. Burton:** What about the government reconsidering its view about this motion?

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** I did not hear what the hon. member said. Would he repeat his question?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Regina East has a question.

**Mr. Burton:** Would the hon. member persuade the federal government to reconsider its views and accept the motion now before the House which has to do with the production of certain information or documents concerning a proposed second national park in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** I appreciate that the hon. member is very concerned about Saskatchewan, I am equally concerned about a park being initiated in Manitoba. The federal government is doing its utmost to initiate both projects with benefits not to one province only but to two. I agree there should be a park in Saskatchewan, but it seems to me that it should be the policy of the federal government to deal with the nation as a whole and not only with Saskatchewan or Manitoba.

**Mr. Burton:** Does the hon. member not consider it would help him in his objective of securing a second national park for Manitoba if this information with respect to a proposed second national park in Saskatchewan were made available to the public?

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** I am all in favour of any number of parks.

**An hon. Member:** Answer the question.

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** That is what I am trying to do. If Manitoba or Saskatchewan wish to establish other parks on their own, I am in agreement. At the moment, I believe the province is responsible for long-term planning, if I may use that term—

**An hon. Member:** Go ahead.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):**—and has responsibility to preserve land for the enjoyment of the citizens of the future, keeping it as a wilderness for the recreation of those who come after us. This is the policy of the federal government, and I cannot understand why the Premier of the

[Mr. Guay (St. Boniface).]

province changed his mind. He was in favour of the project when he was in this House, but now he is Premier his views have altered. According to the *Free Press*, he is reported to have said: "I am less interested today than I was five years ago." Mr. Speaker, I am interested every day of the year when the federal government has the common sense and initiative to help the people in our western provinces.

**Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, there are certain pertinent comments I should like to put on record and address to hon. members in connection with the motion now before us.

[Translation]

I should like to make my remarks in French, Mr. Speaker, because it is the language in which I can express myself more easily and more fluently, particularly when I have no prepared notes.

The motion before the House reads as follows:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area which the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area.

I do not possess much information on the area referred to in this motion, but I think it gives me an opportunity of making some comments of a general nature which can apply to any other proposal for national parks in Canada.

Earlier today, when I heard my two hon. friends exchanging remarks across the way, I made the following reflection: if it is difficult to determine the best place for the location of a national park in western Canada, I am prepared to accept every proposal of the government for the location of a third park in New Brunswick.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the motion proposed by the hon. member, asking "for a copy of a description of the area" could lead to a sort of excessive speculation on the land to be included into the general area of a national park. And it seems to me that the fundamental question to be asked—

[English]

**Mr. Burton:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whether he was in the House to hear what my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Knight) said a few minutes ago in answer to earlier remarks about the possibility of speculation? My hon. friend said that most of the land in this area is Crown-owned; it is held on lease by various ranchers or farmers but speculation does not come into the picture. If at any time there are negotiations for the sale of privately-held land, people will be fully aware of what they are about.

**Mr. Corbin:** I was not in the House at that point in the debate. In this case we are, it is true, dealing with Crown land, but what the hon. member is trying to establish is the principle that the government should be obliged to table a map or general description of any area which is in the future to be designated as a national park. This is the heart of this discussion. The hon. member may have a point with respect to this particular proposal, but if accepted we would be setting a precedent which could be