

same time; you cannot have trade and traffic, involving railways going to and from the mines, and at the same time keep the place for sport. If you intend to keep it as a park, you must shut out trade, traffic and mining. If you are going to preserve it for mining, do not call it a park reserve; the two things are inconsistent. Then the hon. Minister proposes to let people pasture cattle, in other words, to have ranching privileges, in this so-called public park. I would like to know how ranching privileges and the preservation of wild animals and sport can go together, or how a collection of cowboys in this park is going to add to its attractiveness as a public resort, or a reservation for game and sport. I conclude from all this that there is something in the Bill that we do not understand, and something the Minister does not propose to tell us, for he has not answered the questions put to him by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). He has given no idea of the cost of the scheme or of how many claims there are in the district; he has given us no information on the matter at all, except what is contained in the Bill itself. In this state of darkness in regard to the Government's intention, I think we should proceed very gingerly with this Bill. The hon. Minister objected to the proposal of the hon. member for West Ontario that he should put regulations into this Bill. I do not see why that should not be done. I do not suppose that the Minister, or any other man, can at once draw up the regulations, but he intends to draw them after the Bill passes, and I do not see why it should not be delayed until he is able to insert them. Then we shall know how we are acting. But to ask us to proclaim this district, and to put it under his exclusive control, is asking too much, notwithstanding the confidence we have in the Minister of the Interior. For these reasons, although I suppose the Bill will go to the second reading now, I think, when it comes up in committee, it will be the duty of the House, without regard to party, to scrutinise it very closely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not given us information on a very important matter connected with this measure. If I rightly remember this part is within the limits of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, it is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is immediately on the border of the fertile belt east of the summit of the mountains. Of course, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have declared their intention not to make any claim to these lands, then we will know that we are not undertaking to include their property; but in the regulations as they stand, there is nothing to prevent the company making a claim if they see fit to do so. Now, there are certain provisions of this Bill to which my hon. friend from West Elgin has referred, and with regard to which I shall not again trouble the House; but it does seem to me that in sub-clauses *c*, *b*, *e*, *g*, *h*, and sub-clause 2 of clause 4, extraordinary powers are given to the Minister. In fact, if the Bill passes in its present form, it will be necessary that geographers should describe Canada as consisting of seven Provinces, four territorial Provinces and a Government of the Minister of the Interior. It is, in fact, creating a small Province and holding it under the jurisdiction of the Minister. Now, I can understand that where a Government is treading upon new ground, and where they have no path to guide them as to what to do, in order to carry out the administrative operations they have in hand, the Governor in Council should have power to make regulations; but it is altogether an unusual course to confer upon the head of a Department the power to make regulations that practically have the force of the law of the land. The hon. Minister will see, for instance, that the working of mines is provided for in sub-section *d* of section 4. Why

Mr. CASEY.

should not the hon. gentleman state what the regulations are to be? If there are valuable mines in the territory, why should not the ordinary mining regulations apply? Why should the hon. gentleman take to himself power which would enable him to make arrangements with any private parties for the working of the mines, provided that they conferred upon him a great fortune. That is a power which I certainly would not ask for any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, if we were in the position the Government occupy, and it is a power which I think no Government should ask us to put into the hands of any Minister. It is true, there are some limitations; but in this matter I think the power of making regulations ought to be in the hands of the Governor in Council, subject to the approval of Parliament. Then, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to sub-section 2 of section 4, where he proposes to take power to alter the criminal law. He has power to legislate for the government of persons in the territory with regard to the commission of offences that come under the criminal law. We refused to confer power of that sort on the great railway corporations in 1875. I have no doubt the First Minister will remember the discussions we had in this House when it was proposed to confer on the great railway corporations certain powers for the punishment of their own officers in certain cases; and yet this Bill confers on the Minister power which will actually place the liberty of the subject within that territory in his hands. I do not think the difficulty of making regulations to govern the park is so serious that it is necessary to confer upon the Minister these extraordinary powers. It does seem to me that the Government, when they come down to the House proposing such a measure, ought at least to be prepared to lay before the House general plans and limitations of any power they propose to take, so that it may not become a source of abuse, and the liberty of the subject will not be in the hands of a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. TROW. The Minister of Interior has just stated that he thinks I was the individual who first drew the attention of the Government to the advisability of reserving a portion of the territory near Banff for a public park. I had occasion to visit, two years ago, the celebrated springs, and I considered the place was one of vital importance, which should not be placed in the hands of squatters to be destroyed, because it required very lavish expenditure to make it valuable as it is valuable. I consider that no one should be allowed to lease that property unless he was in a position to expend from \$80,000 to \$100,000, because it is unquestionably, in my estimation, the greatest boon to this Dominion. Immediately after leaving the springs, I made it my business to have an interview with the hon. Minister of Interior, to whom I stated the Government should unquestionably reserve a large tract of the country, as there may be other valuable springs in the locality not known. I was not aware that I had much influence with the Minister, but I stated the true facts of the case, and that it would be advisable to make of this place a park similar to the Yellowstone Park in Montana. I made it also my business to see the present Minister of Finance immediately afterwards, who, if I recollect rightly, told me he would write the First Minister in regard to my statement. I do not know of any portion of the Dominion that will become more celebrated in the history of this great country than that park. The Bow River, running within a few yards of the celebrated springs, has a depth of thirty feet, and gives thirty miles of excellent boating. Near the summit of the mountains you have perpetual snow in view, and beneath you have natural parks surrounding you for a score of miles. I cannot, under any circumstances, blame the Government for making a large reservation until such time as they know the value of the land in that locality. There