

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

masses of people crawling all over the place and making it literally, as I have said previously, a Coney island, but still providing more facilities than we provide now. Perhaps there could be a further grade of parks. In this case we could have a clearly defined policy and not attempt to satisfy all sides of the argument because, I suggest, we are not now really satisfying any argument.

I raise this matter, Mr. Chairman, for an obvious reason. First of all I think we need to review our general concept of the park policy approach in terms of the way in which the act is written. More specifically, however, may I say this. This house is, of course, aware that Banff has been selected as the Canadian site to hold the 1968 winter games, and here we are going to have these conflicts brought into perspective when we ask the park officials to carry out a development program in order to assist us to secure the games, I am sure will offend the sensibilities of some of our officials who believe that the parks must be kept in their natural state, and we therefore have the conflict all over again.

I wish to say that we have had nothing but absolute co-operation from them up to this point, and perhaps my fears are not well founded. However, I am making this suggestion in order to avoid any possibility of difficulty. Surely we can recognize that in Banff, as an example, we already have invested some \$96 million. If we are going to use that \$96 million to the extent that the government of that day expected the return should be in relation to the people who would enjoy it. We must remember that these facilities, in terms of the amount I have mentioned, really are open for a season of only some three months in terms of even a quarter to half of their potential capacity, and that for the balance of the year the park is relatively vacant.

Our initial concept of bringing the games to Banff was to make Banff more than a one season proposition; to utilize the slopes and the facilities that were there to make it the outstanding winter attraction certainly of Canada if not of the North American continent. This does not mean that we need to deface to any extent what nature has made so beautiful in this area. What it in effect is asking is that we have from the parks officials and in particular from the minister some understanding of the difficulty we shall have if the present regulations continue. We shall necessarily be obliged to construct certain buildings. Obviously you are going to have to remove some trees in order to complete one or two of the jumps or downhill runs. All this is going to require a great deal of co-operation. For this reason I suggest that

here is an opportunity for us to carry out one of the alternatives I have mentioned, either in terms of grading Banff as a national park or in zoning a particular area of it.

I would just close with this thought, Mr. Chairman. I have said I have every sympathy with those who wish to enjoy the vast areas that have been set aside in Canada for national parks. I myself, perhaps, would take the view of the conservationists more than the advantage that may come through the recreational facilities. But I see no conflict if the suggestion I have made is followed to any extent. If it is not followed, however, the present situation will continue; and as I suggested at the outset, I think the present situation really does not satisfy either argument.

Before taking my seat may I just say this to the minister. Through his parks department and through the Crawford report he has made a comprehensive examination of the relationship of the people within the parks area, the residents of the parks, to the government of Canada and to the people of Canada as a whole. I think for the most part the residents who live within the parks are not unhappy with the basic conclusions which Mr. Crawford reached, in which he states that they have never asked for any real form of self-government. It is recognized that the government of the day must have control over the vast sums of money spent by the federal treasury on the national parks. On the other hand there are two recommendations made suggesting a far closer liaison with the occupants of the park, and I think this is something on which we can still improve considerably.

I think in replying the minister might indicate to the committee what has been done in response to the suggestion that a line of communication be established between the elected bodies within the parks and the departmental officials carrying out the joint responsibilities; whether or not the conference suggested has been held; whether there has been collaboration on mutual problems; whether senior officials have visited the area, and so on; whether these recommendations suggested in the Crawford report have been carried out.

Finally I would ask, in terms of the whole problem, if when he replies the minister would be kind enough to indicate whether it is possible, in order to assist Banff in getting the 1968 Olympic games, to set up a committee to work with the Calgary Olympic organization so we could discuss many of the related problems we shall have prior to presenting the brief before the international Olympic board in 1963.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat I wonder whether I could ask