

*International Peace Park*

lakes, attended by many representatives from the United States as well as from Alberta and other provinces of Canada. They decided to approach their respective governments and ask them to declare these two parks in the two countries an international peace park. As I say the bill has already passed congress and has been assented to, and we are now carrying out our part of the contract in the bill which is before the committee.

May I say that the opening celebration will be held on June 18 of this year, at which there will be present representatives from the United States and Canada and from many other parts of the world. There are gentlemen coming from England to take part in the celebration and speak on that occasion. The idea behind it all is to celebrate the one hundred years of peace, friendship and goodwill which have existed between the two countries. There will be four trains carrying the international Rotarians to their great meeting which will be held at Seattle, and these trains will be halted at Glacier station for six hours. The visitors will be transported to Canadian territory, and I would like to invite hon. gentlemen to take part in the celebration. I heartily commend to the committee the passage of this bill.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): When this bill was on the order paper for its first reading, it stood there for four or five weeks, halting, the government apparently not knowing what to do about it. I was wondering if the government was ever going to go forward with it.

Mr. BENNETT: It stood there awaiting the passing of the American bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it awaited many other things besides that. Anyhow it is here now. It has been given its first and second readings and is now in committee of the whole, and I have not yet heard the sponsor of the bill say anything about it. I have no desire to put the Minister of the Interior in an awkward position, but I do not propose to have this bill go through in this somewhat clandestine fashion without my having something to say about it even if the minister won't.

I was associated with the Turtle mountain scheme, which was started four years ago, and as representing the prairies I was in favour of it. The people of Saskatchewan with no boundary line site as good, and the people of Manitoba, were behind it. A secretary was appointed in Toronto, by name Mr. Moore. He has been here comparatively recently and it was from him that I learned the probability

[Mr. J. S. Stewart.]

of this Waterton scheme not being likely gone on with. But here I find it at this stage, in committee of the whole, and the minister has not said a word about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh yes he did.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: At what stage?

Mr. MURPHY: On the introduction of the bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let us hear some more about it, then, as the explanation on the first reading is generally pretty slim.

Mr. MURPHY: I was just trying to be courteous to the hon. member.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am trying to be courteous to the hon. minister, and I want to give him the opportunity to say something more now on this bill. I have some material in my room and I hope to keep this discussion going until eleven o'clock so that I may get my memory freshened up by consulting my material. I had no idea that this was going to be gone ahead with at all. I am very much concerned about it. I saw the peace arch south of Vancouver some years ago, and it is a very beautiful representation of peace between the two countries. I believe in that kind of thing. I believe in both symbolizing and living the peace, but I do not believe in having a scrap among the Canadian provinces for the sake of peace between part of Canada and part of the United States, and that is what my hon. friend the minister is provoking by this bill. You cannot have the whole boundary line seeded down with peace parks, gardens and arches. If you are going to have one peace park in Alberta you will kill the Turtle mountain scheme, and if you are going to have the Turtle mountain scheme it will probably hurt the Alberta scheme. You cannot have and maintain the two as at present constituted. That is the situation as I see it. I did not make any contribution towards the Turtle mountain scheme except to lend it my moral support, and I am going to continue to lend it my moral support, and possibly go a little further at a later stage. I am familiar with the site at Turtle mountain. It was one of the first places I went to in 1881 when there was very little settlement, and I know something of its suitability for a park. The establishment of that park has been under way for four years.

I would also point out that these park names are very similar; no provincial secretary's department would issue charters with two names so similar, but inasmuch as this is a federal bill