

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister could confirm that he sees no slowdown in 1974 in the Canadian economy in, say, the auto industry, the trucking industry or the tourist industry?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I am a seer in the sense that the hon. member may wish me to be, but present indications are that we ought to have a very good year next year. In fact, we had a very good year this year.

[Translation]

ENERGY

SUGGESTION OF JOINT FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF PIPELINE FACILITIES

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Has the federal government already submitted or prepared a cost-sharing pipeline building project to be presented to provincial representatives at their next meeting in January 1974?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I intend to have further consultation with my Quebec counterpart regarding the pipeline. I repeat it for the fourth time.

Mr. Rondeau: I should like to put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Can the hon. minister tell us if he has presented or intends to submit a project to provincial representatives at their January meeting concerning the building of a Canadian pipeline?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we already submitted such a proposal to my Quebec counterpart.

[English]

APPLICATION OF "FORCE MAJEURE" BY OIL COMPANIES

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is a very simple one. Can the minister inform the House on what approximate date he learned that companies might apply *force majeure*?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it is of fairly recent date; I would say the last week or ten days.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. According to the special order of the House, we shall return to the consideration of government orders.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It will not have escaped Your Honour's keen eye that there is active interest in this subject. I wonder, under the guise of a point of order, if the minister would advise the House whether he will in fact be appearing before the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, as has been tentatively arranged, so that this interesting subject may be pursued further?

National Parks Act

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is Thursday afternoon next that I will appear before the committee.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

AMENDMENT DELINEATING GOVERNMENT'S POWER IN DISPOSING OF PUBLIC LANDS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Chrétien that Bill S-4, to amend the National Parks Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern development.

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the question of the establishment of national parks has been met in many parts of the country by a kind of complacent response like, "Yes, we all agree in principle with parks as long as in some ways they do not detrimentally affect our area". Like all others I suppose, I too have taken that line, namely, to agree in principle with national parks. They are nice things for people to visit. But the problem that arises when a national park is about to be established—as was the case in the last five years with the Grasslands national park in southern Saskatchewan—is lack of understanding of the general area and lack of communication with the people involved. There is not usually an in-depth study made about the practicalities of establishing that kind of park. That is what I am dealing with tonight, Mr. Speaker. It is what I was dealing with before my speech was interrupted by the non-statement of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald).

● (2050)

The question of the establishment of national parks is still covered by the National Parks Act. Even with this legislation, the establishment of a new national park will have to be undertaken by the Parliament of Canada.

I am pleased to see clause 2, which makes certain that individual members of parliament affected by a national park in their area will have the opportunity, and indeed the right, to express their views on the establishment of such a park. Since 1965 there have been agreements, disagreements, arguments and consultation between the federal and provincial governments. Earlier today I outlined the kind of partial agreements reached between the provincial Liberal governments and the Pearson and Trudeau governments. It pointed out there were some representations made such as in the Kaplan report, where a bunch of dudes from Montreal went to the Killdeer-Val Marie area for a few days. They then returned to Montreal. Maybe they were friends of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury).

On their return home they drew up a report. They compared it with Roosevelt park in the United States. They said it would attract the same number of people as Roosevelt park, which was fundamentally different from