

demand an answer on that point. I notice that already upwards of \$46,000 have been expended on this enterprise. Now, I am opposed to this enterprise altogether. I cannot see for the life of me why the Government should undertake to prepare hotels for tourists. I do not see that the Government should go into the hotel business at all. Why should they go into the business of preparing public parks as a resort—for whom? Not for the people of Canada, not for the people who pay the taxes, but for the wealthy people of the cities of the Dominion and the cities of other countries. Who are the people who will be called upon to pay the money to erect this hotel, this pleasure park, and the baths for these wealthy people? Why, the workingmen, the fishermen, the farmers of this country; these are the people who must put their hands in their pockets, some of whom can scarcely earn enough to keep soul and body together, in order to contribute to the comfort and convenience of the wealthy people of this continent, and perhaps of the other, too. I protest against the whole scheme, and I hope the Government have not gone so far that they cannot withdraw and leave the matter for private enterprise. If the Government have grounds up there which can be made into convenient parks for public resorts for the wealthy people, let them leave to individuals the business of doing so. There are many other places in this Dominion which could be turned into convenient public resorts; just as healthful baths could be prepared in other parts of the Dominion as in the North-West among the Rocky Mountains; and if the Government begin to do this kind of thing in that part of the country, they will be called upon to do so in other parts of the country as well, and where will it stop? I protest against the whole thing, and I say the Government should leave the whole matter in the hands of private speculators and to private enterprise.

Mr. TROW. I have visited famous springs on various parts of this continent, and I question whether there is any other place more deserving of expenditure than the one now under discussion. I had the pleasure on one occasion of baptising my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in these celebrated springs. I think, however, it would be advisable, before the Government make much more expenditure, to analyse the waters and ascertain their curative properties. There is no such scenery anywhere else on the continent, and I believe a limited expenditure is called for on this park. The Government have not been lavish, so far, at all events. When I visited the park I recommended to the Minister of the Interior that the Government should do something of this kind. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has seen the springs at all, but I took the first opportunity of informing him of the scenery in that locality. The scenery is delightful. It surpasses the Alps. For miles around the tops of the mountains are covered with perpetual snow, and there is a beautiful navigable river to add to the charms of the place. There are no agricultural lands in the locality, so that no person could claim the right of a squatter. There is no land to cultivate except the valley on each side of the river, which is very limited. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) does not seem, from his statement, to understand the geography of the country. The coal lands are entirely separate from the springs, and are distant, nearly three miles, and there is a considerable distance from the springs to the side of the mountains on the other side of the railway to the coal mines, which are partially developed at several points. I approve of the expenditure, and I now know capitalists who would undertake to give the Government 1000 per cent. on all their expenditures if the Government would give them possession of the land, including the springs and coal lands.

Mr. KIRK. Let them give it.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) understood me to say that the springs and the coal

Mr. KIRK.

mines were together, he was mistaken. I was simply referring to coal lands.

Mr. JONES. The principle involved in the question before the House has not received attention except from the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), and that is the appropriation of public money for such a purpose. It is well known that we in this country have given the Canadian Pacific Railway Company an enormous amount, 70 or 80 millions, to construct their railway for the people of the North-West, and for the development of the country in that direction. If anything more is required to attract settlers and visitors to that portion of the Dominion, the expenditure should be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who are going to derive the chief benefit from people visiting that country. Again, I cannot see on what grounds of public policy a Government can undertake to expend public money in a remote part of the Dominion, because it is a remote part, particularly as regards the people of the east, and the expenditure will doubtless amount to a large sum before it is finished. We have obtained no idea yet of the amount required for the completion of the work, and I cannot see upon what principle a Government can ask this House to sanction such an appropriation of public money. As stated by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), the taxpayers of the Dominion will not look with favor on such an appropriation. I protest in the strongest possible language against public money being spent for such a purpose at the present time. The financial condition of the country is not in such a prosperous state that we can afford to throw away money on such an object. We have had large deficiencies; there is depression existing in many parts of the Dominion; in the eastern section, at all events, there is very great depression, and the taxes that have to be borne by the taxpayers are a very great burden upon them; and, therefore, the people of the Dominion will look with much apprehension at the inauguration of a policy such as this, looking forward to a large expenditure. I trust the Government will hesitate before they inaugurate a policy such as is indicated by the Bill of the Minister of Interior to-day. The explanations made by hon. gentlemen who have spoken may apply with great force from their standpoint, but I throw them entirely on one side, because I take exception to the expenditure on any grounds whatever. If those springs are there, and are as valuable as pointed out by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and can be disposed of to speculators for a very large sum, I do not see why the Government are not disposed to accept the offer. The springs will still be there, the purchaser cannot remove them, the people of the Dominion in that section, or whoever may visit the locality, will have the same benefit from them as if they were owned by the Government. We know very well that private enterprise always manages such undertakings much more economically and systematically than does the Government. We, unfortunately, have had too much experience of governmental expenditure in this country in the hotel line as well as in other directions, and therefore I hope this expenditure will not be undertaken. I enter my protest most strongly against the principle of the expenditure. It certainly seems an outrageous departure from the constitutional authority of this House and this Parliament that the Government should have used the authority which they possess under the Governor General's warrant for the appropriation of forty or fifty thousand dollars for an object not of any immediate and pressing character. The authority given the Government under the Act is, that where circumstances arise not foreseen by the Government, and where there is a public necessity for action by the Executive, the Government may act under the Governor General's warrant. But if hon. gentlemen opposite can on their own motion spend forty or fifty thousand dollars on a matter of