

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, that is not a factor at all.

Mr. STEVENS: Then let us leave that out of the question. Why could not a department of the government administer a park area within a province under the laws of the province, just the same as the city of Vancouver administers Stanley park under the laws of the province?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But my hon. friend forgets that there is no conflict of jurisdiction at all. The city of Vancouver has leased that area, known as Stanley park; it operates and controls everything within the park, and of course administers it under provincial laws. Now, my hon. friend must realize that if the government of Canada were providing the funds to take care of Stanley park it would be a vastly different situation.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister misses the point of my question. The city of Vancouver administers Stanley park and conforms with all provincial laws. The city finds no difficulty in administering the park under provincial jurisdiction. Why could not the commissioner of parks—we will get away from the parliament of Canada—why could not the commissioner of parks, being the lessee, we will say, of Banff park, administer that park under the laws of Alberta, just as Stanley park is administered by the city of Vancouver under the laws of British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They do as a matter of fact. But what my hon. friend is complaining about is that when it comes to a question that may be a very vital one, and when the whole administration is federal and always has been, we should be governed by provincial jurisdiction. May I say in passing that we are making no drastic changes in this bill. We have embodied in the Forests and Parks Act of 1913, all the provisions incorporated in the regulations that are to be put in force by order in council. But let me deal with the town of Banff, with respect to the position of which my hon. friend is taking such strong exception. We would have no difficulty in the world, nor would any question arise, were it not for the municipalities created in the park area.

Mr. BENNETT: They are not municipalities.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They are municipalities so far as their population and the necessities of that population are concerned.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. BENNETT: But they are not allowed to organize as municipalities.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is true; nor do I think they are making any serious complaint about that, for the very good reason that they have no financial responsibilities other than to pay taxes for the carrying on of their schools, which they control the same as any other school district in the province of Alberta. They will continue to control their schools, which are under provincial inspection and control. Does not that answer my hon. friend's objection?

Mr. BENNETT: No. They might have that power taken away from them by this parliament at any time. That is not so as to any other school district in Alberta.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, but in order to do so there would surely have to be some very good reasons presented to this parliament before it would interfere in the jurisdiction of the province over education.

Mr. HEAPS: It would be disallowance.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Practically. I cannot conceive of any parliament doing anything of the kind. Moreover, we have to provide in those parks for the necessary control in order to have some uniformity. For example, we have to provide that the same system of taxation shall apply to the citizens of Banff as will apply in Yoho and Glacier parks in British Columbia, because they are contiguous and the same class of citizens will be affected.

Mr. BENNETT: But the town of Golden and the city of Calgary have not necessarily the same system of taxation, one being in British Columbia and the other in Alberta.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But I am speaking of provincial taxation. British Columbia has income tax, and Alberta has none. But there is no particular objection to the taxation applied. I merely mention it as an example of the difficulties encountered. May I say to my hon. friend that in the United States exactly similar conditions prevail; their parks are national playgrounds; and surely the United States are democratic enough. There is no intention, at least so far as I am concerned, of interfering with provincial laws. As a matter of fact, if we appoint the magistrates—and my hon. friend has not mentioned it, but we take authority to appoint constables as well—their jurisdiction to act is in conformity with the provincial laws, because clearly we are going to pass none.