

Mr. CASEY. I simply wish to read a paragraph containing the hon. Minister's promise to give us certain information he has refused to-night. During the debate on the first stage of the Bill I find the following reported in *Hansard*:—

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister of Interior to say that, before he proceeds to discuss this in committee, he will supply an estimate of the cost, and also bring down to us a list of the persons having leases, a memorandum showing the extent of property under lease and the nature of the leases passed?"

"Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Certainly."

That was a definite promise to bring down an estimate of the cost and to state the nature of all the leases. Now, the hon. Minister has stated the nature of some of the leases; he has told us in regard to the timber leases and the mining permits, but he has told us nothing of the nature of the leases given to Dr. Orton and Dr. Brett, and any other parts of the Government who may have obtained locations there; and he has absolutely refused, in the face of repeated challenges, to give us an estimate of the cost, which, on 29th April, he definitely promised to give us before taking this step with the Bill. I now challenge the hon. gentleman again, and ask if he will give us this information, or if he will maintain his attitude of mock dignity and refuse to be questioned on this very peculiar transaction.

Mr. TROW. The argument of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett) seemed to me to be not logical. He states that we have lived alongside the falls of Niagara for fifty years without undertaking to form a public park. Had the Province of Ontario or the Dominion Government purchased that land fifty years ago from the original proprietors, we might have had that as a park much cheaper than we can get it under present circumstances. I understand that on the Canadian side the owners are now asking not less than \$10,000 an acre for their lands, and on the American side the State of New York is probably paying at least double that in some instances for the lands which they have procured for that public park. The Government here have taken the initiative while the lands are possessed by the Crown and they can utilise them as they think proper. We do not say that there is any job intended. The present expenditure seems to me not to be too lavish. When I was there a year or so ago, there was nothing to be had but a little pork and beans which you could purchase for dinner for a dollar. I have heard that the healing properties of these waters are unsurpassed and that they have done immense good, and scores of people are going and will go there, and those waters will increase in sanitary value when the necessary accommodations are constructed. I consider this is very desirable. We could not expect to attract our own people when there was no accommodation, and anyone who is afflicted certainly requires some accommodation; but there were no men of capital who would undertake to supply it in that remote region without having some railway communication, and some attempt to ascertain what the properties of the springs were, and without the locality being thoroughly surveyed and laid out. In the meantime, it is for the Government to say what steps they will take to improve it further. I do not say they are justified in expending \$200,000 or \$300,000 more, as my hon. friend has suggested, but I suppose their object is to open roads and make the place attractive. As I understand from the Minister of the Interior, a considerable portion of this amount is still unexpended, being intended for this bridge across the Bow River. It must be a very expensive structure, because the river is very wide at that point, and, if it is to be an iron structure, of course it will be very expensive to bring the material there, to a region so remote from the place of manufacture.

Mr. IVES. I think it does credit to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that, while there is apparently an organised attempt on the part of his colleagues on that side to waste the day on this exceedingly trivial matter, and to

make a little political capital out of it, he and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) have defended the action of the Government. I think we on this side of the House would be willing to leave the defence of the course of the Government to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. It does him infinite credit that he has taken the line he has taken in this debate. When we see the United States, to which the hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of referring on all occasions, taking the course they have taken in regard to the establishment of a national park in Dakota, and the Province of Ontario taking the steps they have to create a provincial park of recreation at Niagara, I think the abstract question of whether it is desirable or not that a national reserve should be made near the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains, is, beyond all question, settled by the people of this country in favor of such a reserve; and, if I am not mistaken, I have heard several hon. gentlemen opposite, on previous occasions when this matter has been under discussion, express their approval of a reserve being made in the west for a national park. I am quite sure that I have heard that principle approved of. Well, the reserve has been made in a sort of a way, and the initiatory steps have been taken to make this property attractive to tourists and the public generally, and a good deal has been said about it both by newspapers on this continent and by the press on the other continent, and it has attracted a good deal of public attention. As I understand the question as it is now presented, the Government is taking absolute steps to do what they have in a sort of a way done heretofore. The public have approved of this. The public have settled on the fact that a park is to be reserved there. It is approved of generally by every one, and the question is, has the expenditure so far been inordinate? I think we may safely take the testimony of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), who says the amount of expenditure has not been more than it should have been. He seems to think that the expenditure has been a wise expenditure, and I should suppose that hon. gentlemen, after their experience in the past few months, would find that this sort of small talk does not go very far with the people. I cannot understand the object, five years from a general election, in wasting the whole afternoon, and for one hon. gentleman to stand on his feet at least a dozen times to address the House on this question, and to badger the Minister, when he must know from past experience that these little talks on little questions amount to an exceedingly small affair when they come to be laid before the people of the country. We have had in the past hundreds of afternoons wasted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the hope of making political capital, but when the day of reckoning came, when the time came to go to the people for a verdict, they had not time to refer to the matter at all, and they must appreciate the fact that it was all lost time. It is too early in the day, five years from a general election and in a hopeless minority in the House, to try to make capital out of this, and I should think it would be better to try to make capital out of something that would be remembered for one year at least and would be approved by the common sense of the people whenever we go to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that any of us who have observed the course of the hon. gentleman, and listened to him in past Parliaments, will be surprised to find that he has not the slightest appreciation whatever of the value of an important constitutional principle which may be involved when there is to be a raid on the Treasury. He has spoken as we expected him to speak, and as we expect to have him speak. Whenever anything cannot logically be defended from the statutes, we know that the hon. gentleman will always be ready to defend it with his