

require to be made in the regulations with regard to the disposal of those water rates. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend to withdraw the fiscal objection to this Bill, to deal with it purely from a sanitary point of view, and allow the Minister of the Interior to see how he can spread himself in making the Banff park a success and a credit to the country.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has spoken eloquently in favor of the proposition to establish a national park. I have not understood, from any remarks that have fallen from any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that the policy of reserving this tract of land has been called in question. I think I have heard almost every gentleman who has spoken rather approving of that policy. Nor have they confined their objection to what the hon. member for Northumberland has called the fiscal question. There has been a question more important than that raised—a question which I supposed the hon. gentleman, from his long experience in parliamentary life, would have been one of the first to express a very emphatic opinion upon. It has been charged by the hon. member for South Huron, who supported the hon. member for Bothwell, that the Government have, in defiance of constitutional usage, and in direct opposition to a positive Act of Parliament, appropriated a very large sum of money for building up this park. Now, Sir, it may or may not be judicious for us, after we have the proper information, before us, to vote this sum of money. What is contended for is this—and it is a proposition that has my most cordial support—that it is dangerous in the extreme to allow the Government to expend large sums of public money without having first received the sanction of Parliament. Parliament in its wisdom has already laid down the lines within which Government may expend the public money without parliamentary sanction; and the question the House ought to consider is simply this; whether this expenditure is within the lines laid down in the Statute. I heard my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) deliver a very flowery speech this afternoon about the medicinal character of the water, the salubrity of the air, the beauty of the scenery, and all that sort of thing. Well, as to the medicinal character of the water, I have failed to hear from the Minister that he has had any analysis made of it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That has been said two or three times. If the hon. gentleman looks at my report he will find that Mr. Sugden Evans analysed the water.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I have not read the report; but the medicinal character of the water, the salubrity of the air, and the beauty of the scenery have not been improved by the expenditure of \$46,000 of public money. They remain the same, and hon. gentlemen may talk as they please, but this broad fact will remain, the expenditure of this large sum is not in the interest of the public at large, and cannot be for the benefit of the poor. It is entirely for the benefit of the wealthy. My hon. friend from Northumberland can afford to spend hundreds of dollars for the benefit of his health in going hundreds of miles from the centres of population to visit this place; but how can a poor man go, whether he lives in Ontario, Quebec, or the Maritime Provinces? I do not wish to make this a sectional matter by any means; but this illegal and unconstitutional expenditure is an act which this new Parliament should at the very earliest moment place itself on record against. I think it would be a lamentable thing if we should sit here silent and endorse that action. What is the use of having an Act of Parliament at all? We know that there is nothing the English House of Commons guards more jealously than its control over the expenditure of public money by the Government; and the same jealousy should exist, and has existed here, and Parliament has embodied that jealousy in a statute. Can hon. gentlemen contend that they have

acted within either the letter or the spirit of that Act? No one has so contended or can so contend. The money has been illegally and unconstitutionally spent, and with the knowledge of the fact that a new Parliament was about to meet. The hon. gentleman, if he intended to expend that money, should have come before this Parliament, laid his plan before us, showed what the total expenditure was going to be; and then, if after examining our financial condition we thought it was justifiable, we could have given him authority to expend it. My hon. friend from Northumberland talks about the United States. Why, Sir, is there any parallel to be drawn between the United States and this Dominion with reference to the expenditure of public money? No one knows better than he does that the United States Government have such a large surplus that they do not know how to expend it, and it is quite right and proper that that Government should expend money in the improvement of the Arkansas Springs to which he has referred. I have no doubt that they did it legally and constitutionally, nor have I any doubt that they are able to afford it. But there are two questions that we ought to decide. In the first place, has this money been expended unconstitutionally? If it has, I say the House ought to censure that expenditure. In the next place, before we vote a dollar of it, we ought to be satisfied, from information from the Department, what the total expenditure is going to be, and whether the financial condition of this Dominion is such as to justify it. I would like the hon. gentleman, who has spent \$46,000 unnecessarily and illegally on this park, to stand on any public hustings of Canada, and defend his action before the people who are feeling the taxation of the country so severely. It is all very well to talk about the medicinal qualities of the water and the beauty of the scenery. There are many things we would like to have in this country if we could afford them; but, in homely language, we have to cut our coat according to our cloth, and I doubt whether the people either in this end of the Dominion or the maritime end will sanction what seems to me an unnecessary expenditure of public money. We are at the present time passing through almost a financial crisis. We have an abnormal deficit, the largest we have ever had, and from what I can gather we are on the eve of the announcement of another deficit not quite so large; and is this the time the hon. gentleman should choose to engage in an expenditure, the limits of which he cannot state to this House? We are now on the down track, giving the hon. gentleman *carte blanche*, and if the hon. gentleman's conduct receives the approval of this House, if we sit in silence and ratify his unconstitutional act, what can we expect in the future? In the part of the country I come from it is almost impossible to wring out a cent from the Government for necessary public works, without which the people cannot carry on their business. Oh, but, we are told, you are to have a Banff national park 3,000 miles away. That is not a satisfactory answer to the tax-payer; and although you may carry away hon. members in this House, when you come down to the level of common sense, your act is unconstitutional, the expenditure is uncalled for, and it would be politically criminal on the part of this House to allow this thing to go on. I reserve any expression of opinion as to whether it would be desirable in the future to expend money on this national park. It may or may not be so; but I say at the present time, in our present financial condition, we are not justified in expending a large sum of money for any such purpose. I oppose it on these grounds, and I condemn in the strongest language the unconstitutional conduct and violation of statute law which have been exhibited in this expenditure of \$46,000 without the approval of Parliament.

Mr. BURDETT. As a new member, before being called upon to justify the unauthorised expenditure of public