

Supply—Northern Affairs

some of the local Liberals in British Columbia used the minister's answer in an effort to hamper the attempts of the British Columbia government to complete the Pacific Great Eastern Railway. An attempt was made to tell the people that if we did not finish the Pacific Great Eastern but had the Howe Sound highway, the federal government would take over the development of this great national asset, Garibaldi park. I do not know whether the people concerned did not realize or were not aware of the fact there is a new highway within a very few miles of the southern entrance to Garibaldi park. I hope the government will soon build a main highway off that to the entrance to Garibaldi park, and will at that time offer to hand over the unencumbered title of Garibaldi park to the federal government.

I am firmly convinced the resources of the provincial government are not nearly sufficient to develop Garibaldi park. If the park is developed by the federal government as a national park, and if a highway is built from the southern end of Garibaldi park to the northern end, it will do a lot for the economy of the province. It will help Canada and it will make new recreation facilities available to some 10 per cent of the people of Canada, not to mention the tourists who would visit this park from the United States.

Mr. MacInnis: I should like to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, in support of the argument the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has made in connection with what is known in British Columbia as Garibaldi park. Strangely enough, shortly after I became a member of this house I had some correspondence with the former minister of the interior, which he passed on to the then minister of trade and commerce, who was a member of the cabinet from British Columbia. I believe it is a fact that the former government of British Columbia, that is, the government of the late Dr. Tolmie, in 1930 or 1931 offered the Garibaldi park area to the federal government for development as a national park.

I was informed by Mr. Stevens, who was then the minister from British Columbia in the cabinet, that the reason the federal government did not accept at that time was that there was no money available for the development. I do not believe that excuse holds today. I am rather sorry that I did not look far enough ahead to have this correspondence with me. It is now hoary with age, but I assure the minister that what I am telling him are the facts, and they can be proven by reference to the correspondence. Everything the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has said about the beauties of Garibaldi

[Mr. Regier.]

park and the advantage it would be to the large population in British Columbia, which is congregated in that small section of the lower mainland, is quite correct. I would be glad indeed if the minister would give some study to this matter. I can see no reason why he should not study it, because it is so important to British Columbia. In doing so I am sure he would have the support of his colleague who represents that area.

Mr. Churchill: I have been encouraged by the minister to ask one or two further questions. What is the basis of the minister's estimate of expenditures in the various national parks? Does it bear any relationship whatsoever to the number of visitors? Upon making a hasty calculation from the estimates for this year and the number of visitors as shown in the report for 1952-53, I find that at Banff national park the expenditure would be about \$2 per visitor, at Jasper about \$5, at Prince Edward Island national park 70 cents and at Riding Mountain national park 50 cents. Is there any relationship between the expenditure and the number of visitors?

Mr. Lesage: There is of course to a certain extent; it is one of the factors. But the factors to be considered are numerous and varied. Much depends upon the stage of development. So far as I am concerned, I receive reports from the director of the parks branch in respect of the various parks, setting out what is required by way of improvements in a given park for the coming year. We establish an order of priority, and look into the matter ourselves. We must decide what is a reasonable amount to be spent in a park in any given year, and the order of priority of the various projects. Of course the number of people attending the parks is one factor, and the stage of development is another. The encouragement given to tourists is another. It must be kept in mind that costs in the mountain parks are higher than they are elsewhere, and there are various other intangibles that must be considered. I am sure my hon. friend, with his experience, knows very well the kind of study that must be made, when it comes to a decision as to what will be spent in one park and what in another.

Item agreed to.

National parks and historic sites services—
305. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and new equipment, \$3,640,735.

Mr. Campbell: Would the minister answer the question I raised a while ago?

Mr. Lesage: We propose an expenditure of \$21,000 this year for the construction of an