

Supply—Northern Affairs

should like to tell him that I have gone over the records of negotiations between the two governments and the correspondence between departments in the government. I know of his feelings and I appreciate that the agreement was made in 1954 under his signature. At this time I wish to extend to the hon. member my appreciation for bringing this matter to my attention and to tell him it has determined me to take a good look at the considerations affecting the lives of these people in Newfoundland. I could say much more at this time but I think it would be more proper to do so after we have given it full consideration.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the minister and I wish to make one observation. I feel notwithstanding what may have been done at a previous time there should be equal treatment by the federal government for Eskimos in all the provinces. Of course there may be a difference between the provinces and the territories. That is all I was urging.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Yes, thank you very much.

The hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville was discussing Fort Lennox. I should like to inform him at this time that we have increased the vote this year with respect to Fort Lennox which is a beautiful tourist attraction with great historic connotations relating to our country. The estimates will indicate that the vote has been increased this year from \$10,000 to \$45,000 and we have moved a little ahead of the hon. member in that regard.

I should also like to point out to him that neighbouring historic parks and particularly Fort Chambly has a comparative expenditure of \$5,000 and another, lower Fort Garry which is somewhat further removed, has a comparative expenditure of \$20,000. So on the whole Fort Lennox has received in my opinion rather favourable and friendly treatment from the department this year. I appreciate that this fort needs a great deal of work done on it and I should like to remind him that when we finish the rewiring we shall continue the work in relation to this and other historic sites.

I wish to point out to the committee in relation to historic parks that every Canadian owes a responsibility to future generations to see that these landmarks of our history are preserved.

I know how immense the task is and any person does us a great favour by bringing to light the various historic landmarks of the nation's history so that we can make the first moves to protect them in order that over the years, as the money is forthcoming, we can

restore them and do something of a permanent nature so that forever afterwards they will be there as a reminder of what happened in the formation of our country's history.

I would like to add a word in regard to historic parks. Even though we do have a nominal charge for the national parks, we do not make any charges in the historic parks.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt spoke at some length about the French river and its possibilities as a tourist attraction because it lies at one of the historic routes to the west. Every person who knows Canadian history knows that this was the trans-Canada highway of two and three centuries ago. At this time I take great pleasure in telling the committee that the department has decided on and is going forward with a program of marking all these historic canoe routes in Canada, and I am sure there will be a marker close to the Recollet falls and at the other historic landmarks in the constituency of Nickel Belt.

However, in so far as the hon. member's remarks applying to our development program are concerned, I am not too certain. He belittled the program and referred to it as a rocking chair program, and rather spoofed the word "vision". He then went on to make suggestions about roads to resources in his area and asked for information about them. My statement of policy at this time is a repetition of what I told the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. The policy is this, Mr. Chairman. Where agreement has been reached between two governments and a letter has gone forward from me giving it informal and tentative approval to go ahead, we can announce the location of some of those roads and as to where the roads will go but while any discussion between the two governments themselves are being carried on, it is part of our policy not to discuss those roads until a final decision is made.

Mr. Pearson: May I ask a question there? I am sorry to interrupt the minister. Is not it the responsibility of the provinces to initiate proposals or discussions in regard to access roads?

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I was going to deal with this question of policy with regard to another hon. member and I hope that when I come to his question he will pardon me for answering it at this time, because an inference could be drawn from what was said here in the remarks of two or three hon. members that it was the responsibility of the federal government to initiate proposals to the provincial governments as to which roads should be built. Exactly the opposite is the case.