

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

years the hon. member for South Shore has been hollering about this problem, but nothing seems to be done. It is just like the situation regarding the pensioners.

What will happen if things continue the way they are now? My goodness, we will be on pension, and if the pension is only at today's rate it will be a very skimpy life for us. The situation of our marine resources is very serious. On that note, Mr. Speaker, I will continue tomorrow. I hope hon. members will come back and hear me finish my remarks.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT  
MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

**NATIONAL PARKS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—  
ESTABLISHMENT OF SECOND FACILITY**

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, after listening to the strong strictures of my colleague from South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) and the sparkling, scintillating and sardonic speech of my hon. friend from Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Peddle), I have the feeling that this is rather a poor night for a philosopher. Nevertheless, I will refer to the question I asked the other day of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) concerning the establishment of a second national park in Prince Edward Island. This question was prompted by my anxiety concerning recent press releases in the Charlottetown and other newspapers which suggested a departure from the program which the minister outlined in the House last session.

On March 13 I asked him about the establishment of a second national park in our province and his reply, I thought, was most favourable. It was:

—this project has not been definitely announced. My Parliamentary Secretary met with the Premier of Prince Edward Island this week, and they made considerable progress with this plan to establish a second national park in Prince Edward Island. No agreement has been drawn up yet and federal government payments will come under the policy established in British Columbia where we paid 50 per cent of the purchase price of land situated along the coast.

● (10:00 p.m.)

The minister also said that his Parliamentary Secretary and the Premier of Prince Edward Island had agreed to start drafting an agreement, all of this on March 13, 1970. In a recent newspaper I read of meetings between the minister and the Premier of Prince Edward Island held last Labour Day. Later a federal parks spokesman, I suppose alias a well-informed source, to use the jargon of bureaucracy, was quoted as saying:

The province must provide the land for a second park free and clear for development. Because land must be expropriated this involves some heavy provincial expenditures for the P.E.I. budget.

[Mr. Comeau.]

I would say he is darned right. It would involve a great expenditure for the Prince Edward Island government. This is a serious de-escalation of Dominion government commitment. No longer do we hear of Ottawa paying 50 per cent, the arrangement which was made with the affluent province of British Columbia some time ago. Now, if we read it right, it is all to be paid by the province of Prince Edward Island. Surely little P.E.I. should get a deal at least as generous as that given to that wealthy empire on our west coast. If not, what has happened since the ides of March, 1970? Why does our province not now rate the same formula which the minister revealed in this House during his welcoming years?

It was, I believe, common knowledge that the site chosen for the second park was in the far eastern part of Prince Edward Island, in Kings County in the constituency of my hon. friend from Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). I know this area well, having spent the first ten years of my life—just a few years ago!—in the area. It contains one of the most beautiful beaches on this continent. I refer to the south lake area. This is near the north lake area which is now becoming the tuna capital of the Atlantic area.

If there are problems in reference to this location, perhaps because of the propinquity of much of the adjoining property to the finest agricultural land, thus creating an economic problem, I think we should know quickly and precisely what the current attitude is. There is now considerable currency given to the suggestion that the federal government may have withdrawn from its commitment to offer a second park, and that instead it will substitute a substantial extension of the one now existing which happens to be, according to figures and observations, one of the most popular national parks in this country, as well it might be because it is one of the most beautiful.

This park, with its hundreds of thousands of visitors, is far too narrow for the kind of development that is important for modern recreational needs. Even if the second park promise is not repudiated, the P.E.I. park as it now exists must be enlarged to meet the demands of its ever-enlarging flow of visitors to our province, so welcome in our midst. If this is to be done, it would be only fair that Ottawa make at least as good a contribution as was promised in reference to a new park. The P.E.I. government, with its limited resources acquired some 30 years ago the original land for the present site and turned it over free to the Dominion government. If there is a new policy for new parks whereby the 50-50 deal is abandoned, surely with the extension of the existing park, where the province provided all the land, at least that 50-50 generosity should be forthcoming. I use the expression "at least" in reference to a province which built its hopes upon the promise of having a second park.

This, sir, is my reasonable suggestion. I expect the eminently reasonable Parliamentary Secretary, a colleague for whom I have high regard, will be able to come forth with a reasonable response to my suggestion, and if he has been advised to temper reason with generosity, I shall not demur.