

Government were wise in reserving this park, and that the sooner the work of bringing it into play was completed the better.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been greatly struck in the course of this debate, and more so, perhaps, by the last speech than by any other, with the wonderful properties of this water. These springs are certainly the most extraordinary springs I ever heard of. It is not only the description which hon. gentlemen have given of their curative properties, but it is the effect that the water has had on themselves. We see these effects. They produce an immense exaltation of sentiment, a wonderful development of the poetical faculty, and union and concord between gentlemen who ordinarily think very differently on almost every other topic. Why, the county of Perth, for the first time since I have known it, seems to be united. My hon. friend from the north riding (Mr. Hesson) and my hon. friend from the south riding (Mr. Trow) shake hands across the Banff Springs, and each one of them drops into poetry on the subject. And not merely are they poetical, not merely is there an expansion of mind and an elevation of feeling, but there is a regardlessness of base pecuniary considerations that shows not merely that the springs may be of use to those who are lucky enough to be able to pay their fares on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that there should be an appropriation to bring them to every man's door. One hon. gentleman on this side said that if we wanted to sell them we could get one thousand per cent on the expenditure, and the First Minister has just repeated the statement. Now one thousand per cent. on our expenditure would be just \$4,600,000, and springs that can produce in the Parliament of Canada that statement, seriously made on one side and emphasised by the leader of the Government on the other, are certainly springs that the nation should keep to itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that, among their other effects, these springs have had the result of blinding the First Minister to the very plain terms of the Act of Parliament under which alone the Governor General's warrant can issue. Those terms are clear and precise. One reason only is assigned by Parliament for justifying the Government in meddling with the public money, before it is voted by Parliament, and that is when an entirely unforeseen urgency occurs, and it is illustrated by the words "such as an accident to a public building requiring repairs." The argument of the First Minister may be a very good argument for voting money for the purpose of developing and improving this property, if we decided on erecting a national park; but I submit that it was not a sound argument to justify him or his Government in taking a considerable sum of money out of the public Treasury and appropriating it to a purpose for which there could be no urgency. There may have been an urgency for reserving the site; but there was no such urgency as the Act of Parliament contemplates, for spending that sum of money in the month of July or August. Surely the Government must have known of these springs a considerable time before. Two of my hon. friends, some time prior to that expenditure, called the attention of the Government to the desirability of preserving this property for public use. The House sat until the 1st of June last year, and the Government could easily have taken a provisional vote. They did not, however, but chose to have recourse to the process of taking money by a Governor General's warrant, and I contend that there has been nothing stated by the First Minister to justify in the least degree the use of that power for such a purpose. I intend to call attention to the use or abuse made of that power at a later period; but I will just read for the benefit of the First Minister, who is not perhaps as familiar with the Audit Act as is desirable, the conditions under which a Governor General's warrant is issued:

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"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, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor General in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, &c."

Now, I submit that if this expenditure of \$46,000 for the Banff Springs comes under the terms of that Act, there is no use whatever in our attempting to put any restrictions on the power of the Government of Canada to take money out of the Treasury and expend it according to their own will and pleasure. Just as good reasons could be given for the expenditure of \$40,000 or \$400,000 for that matter, in any part of the Dominion where they chose to expend it. I think the power has been grossly abused, whether it is a desirable thing to have the park or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the unauthorised and unwarranted expenditure the Government has made on this park is deserving of the very serious consideration of the House. This is a question wholly apart from the merits of the undertaking. The establishment of the park may be wisely proposed in the public interest, and the expenditure on it may be a national advantage; but that is a question apart from the propriety of the Government undertaking to spend money without the sanction of Parliament. We know the position the hon. leader of the Government took in 1875, with reference to the expenditure proposed by my hon. friend from East York on the telegraph line along the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend was authorised by an Act of Parliament to build a line of telegraph along the railway. It was found necessary, before certain portions of the line of railway were absolutely located, and in the furtherance of the work of survey and exploration, to establish a telegraph line. Parliament had made the necessary appropriations, but because the words "along the line of railway," were used, and because the telegraph line did not in every instance follow the line of railway, the hon. gentleman declared that the expenditure was an illegal, unauthorised and unconstitutional expenditure. I have his words on that subject, and while they were not warranted by the question then under discussion, they are warranted by the question now before us. The hon. gentleman said:

"These contracts were therefore illegal, and if the hon. gentleman spent a single farthing on them the Government would be putting their hands into the public Treasury without the authority of the law, and would be guilty of a great illegality. This House would be bound to do what had been done in the case of the Churchward contract, in order to vindicate the rights of Parliament, and declare all these contracts absolutely void and illegal, without any binding effect or obligatory force whatever."

That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman with reference to an expenditure upon a telegraph line that was authorised, but taken upon the ground that the telegraph line did not follow a line of railway that had been actually located. Now the hon. gentleman comes down to Parliament and proposes to ask us to sanction an act which is a gross violation of the rights of this House. If there is any matter which peculiarly concerns the House of Commons, it is its absolute control over the money required by the Crown for public purposes. The hon. gentleman first decides that a public park is necessary. Now, I say he ought not to have so decided until he had parliamentary sanction. The first step cannot be legally taken towards the establishment of that park until Parliament has made the necessary appropriations. It is the fact of parliamentary sanction being required for such appropriations that gives Parliament efficient control over public affairs; and it would be converting this House into a mere registering body of the wishes of the Administration, if we for a moment consented to the principle that the Government shall make appropriations for public