

Government without serious cost, I think it would be desirable to do so, so that the whole of them should belong to us, except in so far as the building up of a town on the opposite side of the Bow River may necessitate the sale of a portion of them for that purpose. The object really is to make an attractive resort and to benefit that part of the mountain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the course pursued by the Government in relation to preserving that property as a public park. I think amongst the earliest means of calling the attention of the Department to the matter was a letter addressed by myself to the right hon. the Premier, after I had visited those springs and saw what they were like. I have had some experience in visiting some of the springs of the United States, and I saw what difficulties existed in that country in relation to such resorts. The Minister has correctly stated that they become the resort of a very doubtful class of people, so that life was, and is now, practically unsafe in many of the southern springs. I think it is of great importance that these springs, which are said to be of very great value for their disease-curing qualities, should be preserved for the use of the sick in such a manner that they can enjoy the greatest amount of comfort, and be surrounded by the greatest respectability. As to the extent of the park, I for one do not object. Anybody who has seen that section of the country knows that it is practically a territory of mountains, and when we consider that an immense lake exists in the middle of it I don't think it would be wise to risk the limiting the amount of the property taken. As to the regulations which ought to govern such a resort, I must say that I do not exactly agree with the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in relation to that part. It is impossible to make these regulations and embody them in an Act of Parliament; you can only tell by the experience of the persons controlling such a place, from month to month, and from year to year, what is really required in order to establish those health-giving resources of nature on a proper basis. For that reason I do not think it would be wise to embarrass the Minister by asking him to embody in the Bill the regulations under which the springs should be governed. I do think, however, that when the Bill comes to be discussed an estimate ought to be given of the contemplated outlay, and also, as nearly as can be arrived at, a statement of any of the embarrassments or difficulties in the way of private lands within the limits of this reserve. I am aware that there are hotels building on the property, and I think it is desirable that that should be the case. Two years ago when I was there the people were flocking to the place, and they were lying on the hill-sides and rocks taking the benefit of the springs, without any of the comforts and conveniences that sick people ought to have; and if one-tenth part of the reports of the health-giving qualities of these springs have any truth in them, then I say that no reasonable amount of money that the country can lay out in improving and beautifying a locality with such advantages should be—and I am sure will not be—refused by the Parliament of Canada. Therefore I give the measure introduced by the hon. Minister such a fair and just support as, in my opinion, it has a right to receive in this House.

Mr. CASEY. I think everybody is agreed as to the advisability of reserving some portion of our vast domain near the Rocky Mountains for the purposes of a public pleasure ground. But I must differ from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and agree with my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in thinking that the provisions of this Bill are something very different from a mere reservation of a public holiday ground, and that they are, in fact, extremely peculiar in their nature. In the first place, I call the attention of those who have not read the Bill to the fact that, in dealing with these two hundred

and sixty square miles of territory, the Government is freed from the trammels now laid upon them in dealing with the public lands in the North-West, by the Dominion Lands Act, and any regulations made under said Act, or any other Act with respect to mining or timber licenses, or any other matter whatsoever. Now, it is evidently expected and believed by the Government—probably they know as a matter of fact—that this reservation included not only lands fit for some purposes of settlement, but territory containing minerals, territory upon which timber is growing, or upon which timber licenses may naturally be expected to issue. The Government, after proposing nominally to reserve this district as a public pleasure ground, contradict that statement by taking to themselves power to deal with it in the way of issuing timber licenses, mining licenses, and so on. They first introduce an Act on the assumption that it is proper and advisable to withdraw this land from settlement, from mining, from timber licenses, for the purpose of making it a public playground, which is a very good purpose, and then they turn round and take to themselves power to give licenses to cut timber, to dig minerals, to pasture cattle, to build hotels, to lease or sell the lands, and to make provision for trade and traffic of every description. So, after pretending to preserve the lands for a park, they say they do not intend to reserve them for a park at all, but they are reserving power to deal with them as if they were still public property, by giving these licenses just as in any other part of the public domain. The only effect of the Act in that respect is to set the Government free from the restrictions placed upon them in their dealings with the public lands, under the Public Lands Acts, by the repealing of those Acts so far as they apply in these territories, and to enable them to deal with them in any manner they choose. Now, I think that, on the face of it, such an Act is, as my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said, one which ought to be very closely scrutinised. The Government evidently appear to be about to enter into a big speculation. On the hon. gentleman's own statement they are going to give, not exclusive possession, but a limited possession, of the lands around these springs, to certain parties. Now, why should they not give to everybody who gives certain securities and certain proofs of his respectability and the amount of capital he has to invest, the liberty to go and build a hotel near those springs, and have a share of the profit which is to be made out of them? They propose not to do that, but to let the Minister say who is to build private hotels around the Banff Springs; in other words, the Minister reserves power to make the fortunes of some of his friends who wish to go into hotel-keeping. I do not know whether they will do so or not, but he reserves that power. He says that certain parties, one of whom he named—Dr. Brett—another being, I believe, Dr. Orton, lately a member of this House—have already built a hotel near the springs, and he has led us to understand that there will be no interference with them. He does not tell us whether he intends to give a monopoly to them and to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it would be quite within his power under the Act to give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Doctors Brett and Orton a monopoly of the hotel-building there. And if you recollect certain transactions in the way of hotel-keeping which took place in the maritime portion of the Dominion—I refer to the Inch Arran Hotel—we cannot feel confident that this Government is quite above putting advantages in the way of its friends in this way. The Minister reserves to himself the uncontrolled power to give timber licenses and mining licenses to anybody, regardless of the existing Acts on the subject. How can mining be carried on within this district hand-in-hand with the keeping of the place as a public resort? You cannot have a public park, with all the wild animals preserved in it, and have mining industries going on at the