

purposes, as they see proper, and then, after the money has been expended, come down to the House and asks us to decide as to the propriety of establishing such undertakings and spending large sums of money upon them. It does seem to me that this House would be wanting in its duty to the people, as the great trustees of this country, if they permitted this expense to pass unquestioned. What necessity was there for it? If this park was absolutely necessary, the hon. gentleman ought to have known of that when we were here last year; and if he did not know of it, what was the necessity of making this expenditure before the sanction of Parliament was obtained? The hon. gentleman knows there is no such pressing necessity. It may be a very good thing to establish such a park, but it is a better thing to obey the law. Obedience in this matter is better than that superior statesmanship and energy which the Government have exhibited in this instance. It was their duty to comply with the law. We are here sitting as a deliberative and legislative body, seeking to establish laws for the government of the country, and those occupying the highest position are those who give this extraordinary example to the people of setting the law at defiance. The hon. gentleman has shown the estimate which he placed on the independence of Parliament and the respect he has for Parliament; he has shown the estimate he placed on the maintenance of parliamentary authority, by the expenditure of a very large sum without parliamentary sanction, and by asking the House, after the money is expended, to approve of what the Government have done. Why, there are instances where such approval may be necessary. There are instances of some great and unforeseen calamity having happened, of some great emergency having arisen, which demanded prompt action for the maintenance of the state or the existence of some of the institutions of the state. In such a case, the supreme necessity becomes a part of the law, and a justification for the course which the Government may think proper to take; but there is no such supreme necessity in this case. The only necessity in this case was that a certain number of the friends of the Government, a certain number of those who were the camp followers of the Administration, undertook to appropriate a part of the public domain without the expenditure of a dollar, a certain number who were watching the springs, perhaps, as an hon. gentleman on the other side has said, with their guns, for years, as Rizpah watched the corpses of her dead sons—these gentlemen had undertaken to protect the public property, against what? Against the avaricious disposition exhibited by their rivals in the Government camp; and here we have a large expenditure made—for what? Why, to enable the Government to deal with these parties and pay them certain sums out of the public Treasury, for a necessity which had no existence in fact and no existence in law, which existed only in the minds of those parties in consequence of the support they had been giving the Administration. We have not had full daylight let in upon the whole transaction, but enough has been disclosed by a member of the Treasury benches to give us some idea of the actual situation, and how the affair stood before any action was taken, and why action was taken before Parliament met. So, in order to satisfy the demands of rival competitors for the possession of property which did not belong to them, and with the view of reconciling their differences and getting rid of them, the Government made the expenditure of \$46,000, contrary to law, without the shadow of foundation in law, without any authority whatever beyond that which they expected to obtain from an obedient majority in this House. I say except from the support they expect to obtain from that obedient majority, the Government had no possible sanction or authority for what they have done. In my opinion, the House would be negligent of its duty and indifferent to its high trust, if it permitted

the conduct of the Government in this matter to pass without censure.

Mr. DAVIN. At the risk of being irreverent, I will characterise the remarks I have heard from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as parliamentary pedantry.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What?

Mr. DAVIN. Parliamentary pedantry.

An hon. MEMBER. Say it loud and say it slow.

Mr. DAVIN. I will say it as loud and as slowly as the tympanum or dulness of the hon. gentleman makes it necessary. It is a pity, I think, that the hon. member for Bothwell has not visited the Banff Springs. If he had visited them and utilised them, I have no doubt whatever we should here witness an amelioration in the hon. gentleman's general demeanour and even in regard to his oratory, if that be possible, which would be of great advantage to the party of which he is a distinguished member and to this House. Now, if we take the sub-clause quoted by the hon. member for South Oxford what do we find? The hon. gentleman read:

"If, when Parliament is not in Session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good."

The hon. gentleman stopped there, but if the hon. member for South Oxford, who travelled some time ago to the North-West—I happened to have had the pleasure of being in his company as far as Calgary, and I do not think he got off at Banff—had seen what is to be seen at Banff; if he had seen the miniature Switzerland to be found there, with sanitary and æsthetic attractions such as are not to be found in any part of the world, I do not think that he would have got up here and said that to have brought—if nothing more had been done—this scene of beauty and health one year or a year and a-half earlier into such a condition that it could be utilised by the general public, was not fulfilling the conditions laid down in the Act as warranting this expenditure. But if we read further we find that:

"Then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent."

What amount of responsibility would the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) leave a Minister? He says that to obey the law is better than high statesmanship. Well, if to obey the law, in slavish adherence to the letter, is better than to act in accordance with the spirit of the law and in high statesmanship, all I can say is: God save Canada from such political pedantry. I confess the hon. member for Bothwell always seems to me to take what might be called the most politically depraved view of a question. I use, of course, the language in a strictly parliamentary sense. A great poet tells us that "the mills of the gods grind slowly but they grind exceeding small;" but if they can do anything slower or smaller than our own Mills they must be miracles of the prolix in grinding and the infinitesimal grit. I was very glad to see the effect that the discussion of this very interesting part of Canada had upon the very distinguished leader of the Opposition. It is always a great pleasure to me to hear that hon. gentleman debate, but it was almost new in my experience of parliamentary life—and I have had some experience before of this life when I was able to observe it from another place—to see the display of humor we were favored with from that quarter, and the display is due entirely to the Banff Springs. As a North-West man, I claim the whole credit of that for