

Mr. ROSS said that the burying ground had been planned off originally without being conveyed to the town by the Canada Company, and he held that when the town had been incorporated all such property within its bounds became its property.

Mr. FLESHER thought that the town of Guelph should have some say in the disposal of the land.

Mr. HODGINS said if the Canada Company had created a trust of this ground for burying purposes they still held the fee of it were it diverted from the purposes of this trust.

Mr. DEACON reiterated his caution against passing this Bill. They should remember that they by passing this Bill would be creating a dangerous precedent. He thought that the title was in the Canada Company.

Mr. FRASER said that the purpose of the Canada Company no doubt in dedicating this land was that it might be for the benefit of those who should buy lands in the town lot laid out by them. He questioned if the people of the township had even the right to be buried in that plot. He did not think, even admitting the title of the Canada Company, which he did not, that they would raise any objection to this change of public purpose of this piece of ground.

Mr. CAMERON said that when this matter was before the learned judges there was not one word about the Canada Company or the township having had any interest in the ground. The old ground had been maintained by the town and township, and the value of the ground should go towards maintaining another ground for the use of both. He apprehended that the plain man who appeared before the Private Bills Committee had been in a manner laughed away. To his mind this matter was a piece of plain natural justice.

Mr. MEREDITH said that it was hardly fair to say that the gentleman who had appeared for the township had been laughed away. It was unfortunate that he (the gentleman) had not with him the documents since sent down to the House. He contended that as the judges had not had the facts, since made known, before them when approving the Bill, it should be referred back to them. The map shown to the Committee was one of the township with the town plot laid out and the burying ground marked, so he thought the outmost settler in the last concession had an equal right in the ground as an inhabitant of the town. He cautioned the hon. the Attorney-General against allowing such a precedent for legislation to be established by their present action.

Mr. FRASER questioned the accuracy of the hon. member for London's description of the map. He was sure that the plan was of the town.

Mr. CURRIE reminded hon. gentlemen that they were only giving power for the diversion of the purpose of the ground, and not giving Guelph the power to sell the ground. He thought some clause might be inserted so that the ownership would be acknowledged as vested in the town and township.

Mr. DEACON spoke in support of the hon. member for London, and contended that the first clause contradicted the remarks of the last speaker.

After further discussion the Bill was allowed to stand over.

The following Bills were passed through Committee:—

Respecting the Stratford and Huron Railway Company—Mr. Hay.

To incorporate the Equitable Fire Insurance Company of Hamilton—Mr. Williams.

To incorporate the Whitby and Bobcaygeon Extension Railway Company—Mr. Wilson.

To incorporate the Brant Memorial Association—Hon. Mr. Hardy.

Respecting the estate of the late Nicholas Sparks—Mr. O'Donoghue.

To enable Isaac Brock Burwell to sell certain lands in Westminster—Mr. McCraney.

Relating to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company—Mr. Williams.

On Mr. Rosevear's Bill relating to the Midland Railway Company,

Mr. WILSON complained that this Bill gave two-thirds of the bond holders power to decide that all the bond holders should exchange their bonds for new bonds, and that the second mortgage bond holders should only get twenty cents on the dollar. It also gave the directors power to issue £400,000 new stock.

Mr. SCOTT said this Bill had received great consideration at the hands of the Railway Committee, and the general impression among the members of the Committee was that its provisions were fair to all the creditors of the road. He considered that it was just that what two-thirds of the bondholders or stockholders might decide should be binding on all.

Mr. CAMERON had no doubt that the Bill had been very properly designed, but its provisions appeared to him to be hardly just. There was a provision permitting the directors to sell any bonds of the new issue which had not been exchanged for old bonds, at any price that they chose.

Mr. PARDEE said that the Bill allowed the exchange of all the bonds. As some number of the bondholders had to be fixed who should decide, he thought two-thirds was a fair number. A large number of the creditors were before the Committee, and appeared satisfied with the Bill.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) said the provision of the Bill with reference to the majority of the bondholders deciding for the whole number was a principle which had been embodied in our railway legislation from the beginning.

RETURNS.

Mr. HARDY presented a return of the timber sold in the Province of Ontario in 1877.

Mr. LAUDER asked when the returns asked for at the beginning of the session would be brought down, and mentioned the return relating to the Mercer estate.

Mr. HARDY said that return was being rapidly prepared.

Mr. CAMERON complained that all the returns ordered should have been presented to the House long before this.

Mr. MOWAT moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 11:20.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Mr. Macdougall—On Wednesday next—Bill respecting Mutual Life Insurance Companies doing business in Ontario.

Mr. O'Donoghue—On Wednesday next—Enquiry of Ministry when and on what day the Government intends to lay before the House a draft of the scheme for the disposition of the estate of the late Andrew Mercer, of the city of Toronto, in so far as the same relates to the rights or claims of his son, A. F. Mercer.

Mr. Lauder—On Wednesday next—Order of the House for a return for copies of all instructions given by the Government or any departmental officer to detectives sent to the county of Brant, together with all correspondence between the Government and the License Commissioners or any of them with the License Inspector, the County Attorney of Brant, or any magistrate or other official in the county of Brant relating to the enforcement of the matters appertaining to the license law in any part of the said county.