

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The historic sites?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: This section refers only to historic parks. I notice the word "sites" is not used at all in section 11.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It covers the whole thing.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The minister will pardon me, but I do not understand how it does cover the whole thing. For example, a building which might be described as an historic site would hardly be set apart by the governor in council as a national historic park. I cannot understand how that could possibly be done. There are many such historic sites—old forts, for instance. The minister says each one of these sites is to be set apart by act of parliament.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, that is hardly correct. If the land is federally owned it can, on recommendation, be set apart by order in council.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I should like to know how in the future such places will be set apart. They cannot properly be called national parks.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But they are historic sites.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: There is no reference to historic sites in this section.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The section says "may set apart any land"; it is the land which is set apart as a park. It may be reserved to commemorate a landmark or an historic event.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: If the Prime Minister thinks the governor in council can set apart as a national historic park an old fort with no land about it other than the land on which it is situated, very well; but I should be surprised if such a thing could be done and could properly be called a national historic park.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I read the section:

The governor in council may set apart any land the title to which is vested in His Majesty as a national historic park.

And it may be set apart either to commemorate an historic event or to preserve some historic landmark. For example, if the governor in council happened to own a few acres of land upon which there was an old fort, such property could be made into a park.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The Prime Minister apparently thinks it would be in order for the governor in council to set apart an old fort without any land around it, and that it could be classed as a national historic park. I am surprised that the Prime Minister holds such a view.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend apparently is not familiar with the wording of the section. It does not say, "may set apart any historic landmark as land"; it says that land may be set apart to "commemorate an historic event" or to "preserve any historic landmark". It is only the land which can be set apart.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: In my opinion, it should read "national historic park or historic site." I would not call an old fort without any land around it a park.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Neither would I.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to say a word in regard to Banff park bathhouse, in connection with the upper hot springs. It is because of the finding of these hot sulphur springs that the idea of the construction of a national park first came into being. The bathhouse at the upper hot springs is hopelessly inadequate, and the minister is aware of that fact. I would suggest to him that a new bathhouse be erected this year. May I point out to the minister and to the Prime Minister that the revenue obtained last year from that bathhouse was nearly \$12,000. It is located away up on the side of the mountain, and it costs a considerable sum to hire a cab to go to it. A new bathhouse should be built down in the valley, and if that were done the revenue would be twice the amount received at the present house; in two or three years it would no doubt pay for itself. The hot sulphur springs is one of the chief attractions at Banff, and not only that; a great many people go there because of the benefit to be derived from the springs. The pool which is used at the present time is so small that a person visiting the baths in the middle of the day would wonder whether there was room for him. The present accommodation is hopelessly inadequate and as far as the minister is concerned I am sure he would need no persuasion to go ahead with the construction of a new bathhouse, and if it is to be done some provision must be made in the supplementary estimates. I can assure the minister that such a building would prove to be a paying investment. Owing to the amount of unemployment in the country, I do not