

completion in time for the tourist travel of this year. I thought it was a matter of great consequence that almost contemporaneously with the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway we should have this great attraction in a condition that would cause the road itself and the country itself to be talked about abroad. For that reason, therefore, the Government took the responsibility, not believing for a moment that there would be any suggestion of party motives in the matter—because there is really no room for anything of that kind—they took the responsibility of expending this money, trusting to the vote of Parliament, when Parliament met, to endorse it. I do not think it is necessary that I should say any more, but I thought it desirable to make this general reply to some of the remarks that were made on the other side.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has chosen to complain that I made imputations against him which he characterised as insulting, and he says that, for that reason, he refuses to answer any further questions from me. Well, Sir, I have seen a great deal of this conduct on the part of Ministers at different times—this putting on of an air of dignity and refusing to answer questions, because of imputations of jobbery or something of that sort, or because suspicions of that character were expressed. But the Ministers who have taken that course have always been very young Ministers, who have not been more than a year or two in office, who are very fresh, and who are oppressed with a great sense of their own dignity, and the result of their taking that course has invariably been to make themselves ridiculous, as the hon. gentleman has made himself on this occasion. The result of his general reply is that he would have saved a good deal of time, if he had made these remarks before, because it was in order to get some of the information contained in that general reply that we have been discussing this matter for hours, and the reply itself had to be couched in apologetic tones, instead of being a mere explanation, as it would have been earlier. I will only touch on one ground of his explanation just now. It was that he had been encouraged to expend this money unconstitutionally, as he admits, by the fact that gentlemen on this side had almost unanimously expressed their approbation of making this reservation. Let it be said finally, and be remembered once and for all, that the questions of the reservation and the present Bill have no connection at all. We are, I believe, unanimously in favor of making a reservation. The question is, whether money shall be spent on it, how much money shall be spent, and how it shall be managed. If the Minister has couched his Bill in such language that, without an explanation from him, it savors of a job, and even with his explanation has a little of that flavor about it, it is his fault and not ours; it is owing to the peculiar construction of this Bill that the opposition of which he speaks has been given to it. I was not prepared to make any opposition to it until I read the Bill when it was introduced the other day, and found that it was such a Bill that we could not decently allow it to pass without full discussion and explanation.

Mr. PLATT. The expenditure of public money when it is for the general advantage of the tax-payers of Canada, or the universal advantage of those who have to supply the money for the public chest, cannot well be objected to; but wherever an expenditure is asked for, the result of which is that it will be to the benefit of the few while the many have to pay the piper, I think then objection may well be taken. I think, Sir, that the establishment of public parks, where they are necessary to the public health or the public advantage, and where every citizen who adds his mite to the amount of money necessary for the completion of such parks reaps his share of the benefit, it may be well enough. But in the project which we are now discussing I take it for granted that of every thousand dollars expended

on the Banff park, as it is called, nine hundred and ninety-nine of those dollars will be paid by tax-payers who will never see Banff park, or derive any benefit from it whatever. Upon those grounds I object altogether to the expenditure of public money for such a purpose. It is simply an extension of the principle, which has been a growing one in this country of ours, of taxing the poor tax-payers of Canada to pay for the luxuries of the rich. It may be all very well for the hon. member for South Perth, the hon. member for North Perth, and the hon. member for Northumberland to visit those springs and bathe in their medicinal waters, but it would also be well enough if those gentlemen would pay for those luxuries, and not tax them upon those who will probably never see the springs or hear of them, except through the newspapers. Now, whether or not this may be a political job, whether or not there may be this or the other political influence which may benefit financially from this expenditure of public money, I look upon it as a job against the tax-payers of the Dominion, a job which is calculated to benefit those who are rich and able to spend their own money to go to that distant region, and that this park will be maintained for the advantage of that class by those who are unable, and who probably always will be unable, to receive any advantage from it. For that reason I object entirely to the expenditure of public money for any such purpose, without the people of Canada having an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. It may be said that what the opinion of this Parliament is, should be the opinion of the country. But, as I understand it, the money has been expended on this park without the consent of Parliament. I am sure, Sir, that, no matter what may be the vote of Parliament upon this question, the money will be expended without the consent of the tax-payers of this country, and on their behalf I raise my voice against the expenditure of money from which they will receive no benefit or advantage.

On section 4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think a limit of time ought to be fixed for these leases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an objection to fixing a limit. As I understand, a portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas, and I believe the plan of the architect lays these out, to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome buildings upon them. These buildings will have to be subject to the approval of the Government, to prevent any monstrosities being put there to destroy the general beauty of the park. We cannot say what length of time we can get people to take leases for in order to induce them to put up handsome buildings. Twenty-one years are suggested as sufficient, but people will not build handsome houses on 21-year leases. If there is to be a limit at all, there must be the right of renewal. I think the hon. gentleman and the House may trust any Government with the settlement of that question in the interest of the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest a further amendment, that is, that all the regulations made by the Governor in Council ought to be submitted to Parliament within a certain number of days after the opening of each Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to that. We will make it fifteen days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that in addition to ordinary habitations the Bill provides for buildings for the purposes of trade and industry. Such buildings will not come under the principles he has laid down.