

*National Parks Act*

park that is planned in the St. Maurice valley.

To my mind, those efforts came to nought because of tourist red tape. At one point, the government of Canada was willing to make a substantial contribution which, unless I am mistaken, amounted to something like \$200,000. The project would have cost around \$600,000 or \$700,000. The Quebec government seemed ready, at first, to make its contribution. The most generous contribution, however, would have come from the steel industries of North America. The major ones had accepted the principle of setting up in the St. Maurice valley a tourist centre with a historical museum to commemorate the beginnings of the steel industry in North America.

At this point, something went wrong. To begin with, the federal government demanded the ownership of every historic relic likely to be found on the spot. In fact, there were enough of them to load several railway cars. The finds went back to 1700, 1750, 1800 and later.

The federal government was willing to leave them indefinitely in the custody of the Quebec government provided it kept legal ownership to them. The provincial governments,—one after the other and I am not trying to be partisan—all turned down the offer of the federal government saying they would take the utmost care of whatever was part of our land, as stated by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle).

• (9:30 p.m.)

I am just wondering if we are not indulging in red tape while depriving ourselves of important and valuable assets such as historic centres could be for our national parks.

Things drag on and on, jeopardizing our tourist industry. There are no national parks in the province of Quebec because we have not yet gone beyond the stage of fruitless legal discussions. The first thing to do is to encourage the thousands of available tourists to visit this depressed area designated by the federal government. We are now overlooking one of our most profitable industries, the tourist industry.

I do not want to be partial. I take this opportunity to congratulate the previous speakers who avoided doing so. I join with the member for Joliette so that the Quebec and Ottawa governments understand that it is perhaps advisable, sometimes, to give in a little and not to be as uncompromising as some jurists who draft legislation.

I do not ask for any special treatment for my province. I would like what is granted to Quebec to be given also to all other provinces. I have come to wonder if it would not be possible to reach the following arrangement: the federal government would contribute to the establishment of the national parks, but would administer them jointly with the province concerned.

One could also devise a formula, as the one, for instance, that allowed for the creation of housing corporations in the provinces.

The tourist industry will benefit directly from the establishment of national parks. It is an industry which is immediately profitable and which will help raise the economy of the most underprivileged areas. There is also another problem that derives from the first one. I mean the pollution of air and water and its implications for the wildlife.

The day will come when the virgin forests will cease to exist, when we will find only devastated forests and polluted lakes. It is high time, I think, that the two levels of Government co-operate. They must at least establish plots of green in Canada so that our sons and our grandsons may know that great nature which the Creator made for the good of mankind. The establishment of national parks will constitute, I think, a valid solution to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am astonished that some people should oppose the establishment of a Crown corporation as suggested in Bill C-152. I do not see Parliament, even if it were the best of legislators, having the necessary ability for that type of administration and I feel that we would benefit from entrusting it to experts.

One or two of my hon. friends from the opposition said that the corporation would be another place where patronage could nest. But why should we veil our faces as if we were Pharisees. Even if it were true, they themselves did exactly the same when in office, and that is precisely what they will do again, if they are returned to power. Such an argument is not at all serious, because I do not see any harm in a government being in power.

I do not say that this government will indulge in patronage, for it is sufficiently objective, at times, to make appointments which are not necessarily based on party considerations. I could mention names, were it not for the fact that it is against the Standing Orders, and say that since the last elections,