

*National Parks Act*

said in this House, it was not acceptable. The people of Newfoundland, all half million of them, all the individuals whom the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion asked to become involved in planning and who now do not even know what is going on, agree that the creation of the Bonne Bay park will develop the east coast—even the whole of Newfoundland—and will bring millions of dollars annually into the economy.

I say to the Minister of Transport: Show us your sincerity in the province you represent. Pound some sense into the heads of your colleagues in the provincial government so that the land may be turned over and we can develop the natural beauty which exists for the enjoyment, not only of Canadians but all North Americans who will flock to our province, bring in the needed dollars and create the employment opportunities which you are looking for. Here are 600 jobs, I say to you, Mr. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. You wanted some concrete ideas: What is wrong with that one?

I have many more ideas for the minister when the appropriate subjects arise in the House, or if he wants to get some advice. I have also many ideas for the Minister of Transport. But I say to them: Don't camouflage the facts with balderdash in this House of Commons. Let us see some of the involvement you have been talking about for the last two years. Let us see some sincerity, I say to the Minister of Transport: Get the people concerned to produce the correspondence that I asked for over a year ago, which they refused to table in this House, with regard to the national park. The minister must know why this was done. Let him show some sincerity and tell us the reasons for withholding the natural development opportunity that is denied our people. What is the tale of woe of the silica mine potential in the area, which the province uses as an excuse for the delay? The silica mine potential and its delay indicates to me and all the experts that the development is being handicapped by one main faction—those who are against the principle of park development.

I challenge these ministers, who are so ready to camouflaging the truth, to show a little sincerity for a change, for the good of the people for whom they are supposed to be working. But don't give me the baloney about the opposition not coming up with ideas. If I may use the words of your experts in the department, they are:

The keystone to progress in setting up an adequate national parks system lies in close liaison between the federal and provincial government. . . . The National Parks Act lays down that the two levels of government must first reach an agreement on the choice of land to be made into a park. Then it is up to the province to reserve this land and assign it to the federal government. Ottawa will then take the responsibility for development costs.

This is stated by your own National Parks Branch. There is an idea, I say to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

I will say just a word about this business of Crown corporations and its relationship to sincerity and pledges by the government. What kind of empty words are these, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Northern Affairs stated in October, 1968, that the federal government would maintain a concept for Canada's national parks and would reject all proposals that threatened to undermine this concept. National parks are a national domain set aside by the Parliament of Canada for all the people. The Minister of Indian Affairs said:

The natural beauty of Canada is a fundamental part of this country's national heritage.

The first Commissioner of National Parks, J. B. Harkin, said that national parks meant a new declaration of rights for people to share in the use and enjoyment of the noblest regions of the country. He also said that it was the duty of a nation to guard its treasures of art and natural beauty for generations to come. The preamble to the National Parks Act of 1930 says—this was mentioned tonight by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) but I think it is worth repeating:

The parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada, for their benefit, education and enjoyment . . . and such parks will be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of generations to come.

These words evidently mean nothing to the government. If it is ready to hand over its responsibilities to a corporation, it indicates nothing more than a breach of faith with the people. Members of the government are only admitting they are not capable of governing the country and are passing the responsibility on to a corporation. Let the government show a little common sense instead of running away from problems. Let it live up to its responsibilities.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, on rising once again to take part in this debate I do so with some hesitation because