

money, I think we ought to have reasonable explanation of what disposition is to be made of the money, and how much is likely to be required. While I am ready to support any Government in any reasonable expenditure which may be necessary for opening up the country either east or west, and making railway or other improvements to induce people to come into the country, I am not prepared to vote *carte blanche* to any Government, either Liberal or Tory, without knowing what the approximate cost of the undertaking will be. If this is to be a new pool of Siloam, let us keep it. We may have those springs and the medicinal benefit therefrom without this national park attached. There are two distinct propositions involved in this measure. I do not see that it is requisite for a man, after visiting the springs to travel over territory, admittedly 260 square miles in area in order to ascertain whether he is fully restored to health or not. We may have the springs in their entirety without the national park. Neither am I disposed to oppose setting apart a portion of our domain for a national park. I think that ought to have been done in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario long ago. I think that a portion of the waste lands and timber limits in each Province ought to have been set aside for the purpose of assisting agriculture, protecting our streams, avoiding freshets supplying springs, and for many other reasons and objects fully discussed, advocated and admitted in the State of New York, in reference to the Adirondack Mountains. But before I feel disposed to vote for the expenditure of money in this direction, I would like to ascertain whether the Government owns this land which they are disposed to set apart for a park. Who has the fee of the soil? If the Government own this land I might be disposed to stretch a point and give them the power to turn it into a national park, but what is the fact? Why we have here hon. gentlemen advocating on behalf of some men—on behalf of what might be called shot-gun proprietors—their rights, and others say they have rights, and the Canadian Pacific Railway contend they also have rights to the soil. Has any disposition been made of all these claims? Have the Government decided on any fixed way of settling these rights? Have the Government or their officers been able, by any means, to secure these rights by paying a fair price for the lands disputed? Have the Government any assurance that there are no settlers on the land, or that if there are settlers, they will sell their rights at reasonable prices? Or will we have to face the probability that, after the Government has made the place valuable, these people will insist upon being paid fancy prices for the land. What I understand by a national park is a territory set apart exclusively for the public, a territory free from settlers, free from corporations, free from monopolists of all characters and kinds. I understand the burning question in the Senate of the United States with reference to the Yellowstone Park was as to whether a charter should be given to a railway to run through the park. People are prevented from taking timber from the Yellowstone Park, they are prevented exploring it for minerals; it has been made absolutely a game preserve, so that all the animals that frequent that part of the country may be free from the hunter at all seasons of the year. I can understand and appreciate that. Does the Government, however, propose to turn our park into a coal-mining corporation, or a lumbering corporation, or a hotel-keeping corporation? Is the latter to be run on the Scott Act principle? Or what sort of a hotel is it to be? We would like to know, and I fancy the Government would be very much divided on that question as they are on many others. I desire to have some information on these points. The moment you allow proprietorship over any portion of the land, by lengthened leases or otherwise, you remove the element of a national park from the district. Allow coal miners

and hunters and lumberers to frequent and work it, and it ceases to be a national park; and they would certainly destroy the game, and the fish, and the scenery, and all the beauties we have heard so much of. I cannot understand why there is not territory enough there to enable the Government to select a portion of the country over which there is no proprietorship except that of the Government itself. We are told a great deal of the medicinal qualities of the springs, and I hope these have not been exaggerated, but I find there has been no such haste in establishing parks in Ontario and Quebec, where I have always understood we had the finest scenery in the world. We have for instance Niagara Falls, than which nothing can be more picturesque and grand, but I never heard of any effort being made to establish a park there until the Ontario Government became alive to its necessity, and at great public expense are trying to establish a park in that justly celebrated region. I would like to know authoritatively whether this is intended to be a sanatorium to cure the afflicted of mankind. We are told that it is intended to heal cripples, but I hope by cripples are not meant the political cripples, whose pockets have been depleted by serving the interests of their party. I hope they are not the style of cripples who are to be restored to health after having been washed in these waters of the fountain of life, as it has been called. Not more than one in a thousand of people can visit this place, and when we are asked to vote supplies for this purpose, we ought to have some reasonable ground to justify our action. So far, I have heard none. It also appears to me that the Government ought to be able to approximate very nearly the actual expenditure required for this work. It does not seem to me there is anything novel in constructing a road, building a bridge or railway, or in erecting an hotel—there is nothing so novel or unknown in these structures as to prevent the Government calculating to a certainty what the cost will be, before asking us to vote the money. If they will make it clear the expenditure is within our limited means, and that these springs have the valuable character assigned to them, let the Government make and keep this as a national park exclusively, and not a park which may partly become a mining or a lumbering district. I do not believe in placing the power of leasing the park in the hands of any Government. No Government is so pure and disinterested as to ask for a particular power, without having a great desire to use it. Powers are not asked simply for pastime or pleasure, but they are asked in order that they may be used, and no doubt if unlimited power is given over this domain to any Minister, it will be used for the purposes of that Minister or of his party, to some extent. I do not blame any political party in using honestly the privileges and rights pertaining to their position, for the benefit of their friends, provided they keep first the public service in view. But I want to guard against the unauthorised expenditure of public money, or the expenditure of public money on a park or for any other purpose, before we have an approximate idea of what the cost will be, and before we know that the land will be kept exclusively for the purpose intended and for no other purpose or reason whatever. If these were the only coal fields or timber limits to be found in the North-West, there might be some excuse for the Government reserving the right to sell or use them, but there are ample mines and timber limits elsewhere which the Government can dispose of. I am prepared to give some assistance to the Government to build the park, but I must first know whether we are going to get the worth of our money. We have lived and prospered and enjoyed a fair portion of health without the Banff Springs. The name is almost enough to destroy any springs, and I would suggest that we should give them some respectable name at any rate. These are the reasons for my objections to this expenditure at this time.