

is professedly making this reservation for the purposes of a public park, but he is really taking power to himself to allow cattle to be grazed, timber to be cut, and coal to be mined, but without regard to the operation of the ordinary laws with regard to mining, grazing and timber cutting. I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the real object of including the coal, timber and grazing lands in the reserve is to obtain, not a reserve for the purposes of a public park, but a reserve for Government supporters; it is to obtain a reserve of lands which the Government may deal with, uncontrolled by the ordinary Acts of Parliament, and for which they will not have to account to Parliament in the ordinary way. If it is not so, if the Minister wishes to avoid that suspicion, he should either make it a part of his Bill that mining, grazing or timber cutting should not go on upon the reserve, or else he should exclude those parts of the reserve in which these operations are intended to go on from the operation of this Act altogether. Either he should take them out altogether or, if he puts them in, he should stop these operations upon the reserve, and make it a public park, as the Bill states it was intended to do.

Mr. ELLIS. I think the whole plan of this measure is very objectionable. I do not think the country wants such a park, or that it is able to pay for it. The Minister has already incurred an expenditure of nearly \$50,000 without the authority of law; the work upon the park is scarcely begun, and he is committing us to an unlimited expenditure in future. I do not see, Sir, that the country, in view of the state of its finances, in view of the fact that it has had large deficits for the last few years, is in a position to take this matter up, because it is impossible to say what the expenditure will be which we are called upon to make.

Mr. HESSON. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down speak against the action of the Government in reference to this park. I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman had paid a visit to that country he would have made a different statement as to the necessity for this park and the advisability of reserving it for the benefit of the public. I do not say that the Government should take too much power by way of regulation, but I do say that any person visiting that part of the country can see the necessity of some person being in control—some person having such powers as are provided for in the Bill, because circumstances may arise there for which you could hardly make provision in advance by an Act of Parliament. I had the pleasure of visiting those springs last October. I spent some time there very pleasantly indeed, and I am glad to see the Government making such an effort to provide for Canada a place of resort which, I have no doubt, will be sufficiently pleasant and valuable, as a place for invalids and pleasure-seekers, as to induce those in search of health or recreation to spend the money in their own country, which hitherto they have been in the habit of spending abroad. I was much delighted with the drives made on the mountain side and the river bank, and I was also surprised when I learned from the engineer in charge how small a sum the work had cost at that time. If it has since cost a considerable sum more, I have no doubt, from the rate of progress which was being made then by the person in charge, that there will be satisfactory results from the expenditure of the money. I can quite understand that to accomplish a work of this kind would involve considerable expense for the necessary labor. But the benefit that Canada may hope to derive from these springs is altogether of a kind that we cannot fully realise to-day. When I was there I saw invalids carried down to the springs in chairs by friendly hands, and when I returned from the Pacific coast I saw these same people able to walk down themselves, and they were basking in the sunshine on the mountain side. I was delighted to hear that the Gov-

Mr. CASEY.

ernment purpose keeping the springs free, so that invalids, or those in wealthy circumstances, who desire a summer recreation, can have their homes there; that the baths will be free for the poorest, and that it was for the poor and the humble, and those most in need of them that they made the drives, and scooped out of the solid rock the basins where baths are now taken. Nature had provided an underground chamber, where persons who had the courage, could go and bathe. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) has been in that bath, and I have been in it myself; and I would advise the hon. member for Bothwell to go there also and take a bath, and he will come back in good humor, well pleased with his country, and disposed to admit that the Government are undertaking a good work. I am sure that the people of Canada, after realising the value of the water there, will never regret that the Government have reserved it for the free use of the people of Canada, and will feel that a little expenditure for that purpose is a wise expenditure after all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The baths may be all that our friend has so eloquently described them, and the park may be an exceedingly valuable institution; but in most English-speaking communities it has always hitherto been understood that before public money is spent by Ministers of the Crown, the authority of Parliament should be obtained for it. There are certain exceptions very rigidly guarded, or intended to be rigidly guarded; but I do not think there is anything in the Act of Parliament which authorises the issue of the Governor General's warrants which justifies the expenditure of \$46,000 of public money on this public park without the authority of Parliament. It would have been time enough to have spent that money after the authority of Parliament had been obtained for the creation of the park. That was the point taken by my hon. friend behind me, which, in his enthusiasm for these healing waters, the hon. member seems to have forgotten altogether. Whatever may be the merits of the park, I do not think anybody can get up here and contend that this expenditure comes under the terms of the Act of Parliament by virtue of which Governor General's warrants are supposed to be issued. I do not think this money has been properly spent, even if Parliament should find afterwards that the park is a desirable thing to institute. That is a point on which I think this committee would do well to ask for some further explanation.

Mr. CASEY. The haze of poetry thrown over this subject by the hon. member for North Perth has led us to forget the promise made by the Minister when we last discussed the question. He promised to explain these expenditures to us—what had been done, and what it was intended to do. He has explained in very vague terms one or two things that had been done; he explained that a road and a bridge had been built, and that another bridge was building. Surely these did not cost \$46,000. The hon. member for North Perth said he was surprised to hear how little the improvements cost up to last October, when he was there. After Parliament met there was an unconstitutional grant of \$31,000 more, which could not have been for the improvements up to last fall. The hon. Minister should tell us what this is for. He has given us a hint that a small part will be expended in bringing water from the baths to the hotel. The hon. member for North Perth gives us to understand that the baths will be free, while the Minister says that he is going to sell the privilege to use the water, at the rate of \$15 per bath-tub, to certain favored persons who are to locate near the springs. We would like to know which is correct—whether there is to be a Government institution for persons who will go there *in forma pauperis* to ask for free baths, or whether its privileges are to be paid for by the guests in the hotels belonging to Government pets. If there are to be free baths, no one will use