

one. He said also that he knew some persons made applications for timber licenses for purposes of speculation.

NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

The debate on new Parliament Buildings continued.

Mr. BRODER contended that the Government wished to keep the question of new buildings as one between the City of Toronto, the Government, and the Opposition. He charged the Commissioner of Public Works with not being serious when he proposed the grant of \$500,000 for new Parliament Buildings, as he well knew that that sum would be insufficient. He did not know that the externals of the buildings need have an adverse influence on the people's education through the people of Toronto. They need go no farther than Massachusetts, where, in Boston, they had quite as ordinary buildings as these, and he had yet to learn that the State Buildings there had not had a bad effect on the aesthetic taste of the people of Massachusetts. Again he charged the Government with not being serious inasmuch as they had brought down an abstract proposition which did not mean anything. If the Government were serious why did they not go on with the buildings? So far as he was concerned he was going to vote against the motion as in his estimation the Government must alone assume the responsibility for the new buildings.

Mr. O'CONNOR—I don't propose to give a silent vote, representing as I have the honour to do, perhaps the largest rural constituency in the Province—a constituency in all probability as important as any other constituency, and concerned on this matter as much as any other in the Province, with the possible exception of Toronto. It appears to me that the erection of new public buildings ought not to be looked on as one affecting only the City of Toronto. It is a direct Provincial question, and not at all a city of Toronto question. Were it merely a question affecting the city I would vote against the erection of new Parliament Buildings. I am of the opinion of John Sandfield Macdonald, and I don't see what the city of Toronto have done for Reform that the Reform party should go out of its way to do anything for the city of Toronto. Let Toronto look to their own friends whom they have supported so many years for the favours they may want. It is decidedly a strange state of affairs when we find, when a matter comes up in which the city of Toronto is so closely concerned, that the gentlemen who should be friends of the city are the persons most anxious to deprive Toronto of the benefits arising from new Parliament Buildings. There is no doubt at all in my mind that new buildings are necessary. The able speech and strong arguments of the member for Hamilton convince me completely, and he made out his case almost perfectly that new Parliament Buildings are required, that the present buildings are not fit for their purpose, and that they are not appropriate for this Assembly. Before the hon. gentleman sat down I made up my mind to vote for new Parliament Buildings when a proper scheme comes down. I will go still further and say that I would advise the Government, as a supporter, and offer the suggestion that I would not lose one solitary vote for the sake of erecting new Parliament Buildings in Toronto. The buildings may be required, but it is not a burning question. We can stand it as long as gentlemen on the other side of the House can. Again I say that I would not risk one constituency for the sake of the new Parliament Buildings. While the affairs between the Province and the Dominion are not settled it would be dangerous to take any risk at all in the matter. We all know that Sir John Macdonald has done his utmost to frustrate the Government of this Province, is doing his utmost to hinder the Province in the administration of her license law; that he has kept Ontario out of the territory awarded her, and that he has done all which can be done to cripple Ontario. If, then, I say, all the differences between the Dominion and the Province were settled, then such a motion could be dealt with in a different manner, but as affairs are I would not take a single risk for the purpose of benefitting Toronto. New Parliament Buildings are a necessity, and so in order to test the sincerity of the leader of the Opposition and so as to prevent him by his amendment evading a vote on the straight question, I propose to move the following amendment to the amendment:—

"All the words after the first word 'that' in the amendment be omitted, and instead thereof there be inserted the following—there be added to the original motion these words:—'And this House is prepared to consider any reasonable scheme for the erection of new Parliament and Departmental Buildings.'"

Mr. NEELON looked at the question as one entirely removed from politics, and considered that the Government should not take any responsibility more than as ordinary members they all took. All the members of the House were equally responsible for their own votes, and he should vote for new buildings in full view of his responsibility, and as quite ready to answer for his vote to his constituency. If any member had a friend from a distance visiting him in Toronto, he would be ashamed to tell him that these were the Parliament Buildings of the Province. This chamber was good enough, but the remainder of the rooms would not compare favourably with those of a poorhouse. There were valuable papers in the Crown Lands Department

in imminent danger of destruction by fire, many of which could hardly be replaced, or at any rate not without great expense. The chief question was, Had they the money to go on with new buildings? The hon. Treasurer had told them that the Province had a surplus of nearly seven millions. He thought, therefore, the work should be gone on with, and he agreed with the leader of the Opposition, that when it was undertaken, buildings such as would be a credit to the Province should be erected. He repeated that this question should not be made a party one. They all admitted that new buildings were required, and when the Government were right it was the duty of the House to support them. He was going to vote for new buildings because he believed they were necessary, and because, on the assurance of the Government, there was a sufficient surplus to warrant the work being undertaken.

Mr. MCINTYRE did not think the Government should assume the responsibility of erecting new buildings merely by virtue of a party vote in favour of them, and if they were going to do so, he would vote against them. It was a question on which both sides of the House should unite, and if the Government had not more than a majority of their own supporters, the work should not be gone on with.

Mr. WOOD was prepared to support a proper scheme when it came down in a proper manner, through the constitutional channels by means of which government was carried on. He had no hesitation in saying new buildings were necessary, but the Government should take the responsibility, and he cordially agreed with the leader of the Opposition in the position that he had taken in maintaining this. It seemed to him undignified on the part of the Government to endeavour to shirk this responsibility. If they made a proposal to expend a million of dollars on new buildings he was prepared to vote for it, and if the Commissioner of Public Works took the same pains to bring down a scheme as he did before when they were asked to vote \$500,000 for Parliament Buildings, he had no doubt he would be able to bring down one which would be satisfactory, and which might be endorsed by both sides of the House.

Mr. PHELPS considered that this was a question which should be viewed without any reference to politics. They all condemned the present buildings, but the Opposition desired in the country to make the erection of new ones a question against the Government. It was proper first to express our opinions upon the necessity and expediency of going on with the work, but he would suggest that after gaining the consent of this House the Government should make a statement that the finances of the Province would not be crippled by undertaking the work. He believed that if it was decided to go on with the work the buildings

SHOULD NOT BE RUSHED

through, but that their completion should be extended over a period of from five to eight years after they were commenced in order that they might be built substantially. He did not think they could be built for less than \$800,000 or \$1,000,000, for he believed when new buildings were put up they should be a credit to the Province. He would have preferred that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. O'Connor) should not have moved his amendments in order that there might have been a straight vote on the question of going on with the work. If they had to borrow money for the undertaking he did not think he was prepared to vote for that.

Mr. WATERS thought he would be stultifying himself in his own estimation and in that of those who sent him here if he voted against the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton, because five years ago he supported a motion for the erection of Parliament Buildings. He was of the opinion that they were needed then and he was so still. He was in entire ignorance about what was now proposed, because no scheme was brought down by the Government, and when one was brought down, then he would be prepared to vote for or against it. There were two or three ways of providing money for these buildings. One was to take the total amount which they would cost out of

THE CASH SURPLUS

of the Province, another to use the trust funds the Dominion held for the Province, or another to issue debentures. The course of the Government with regard to this question was perfectly justifiable. They proposed a few years ago to this House a fair scheme for the erection of Parliament Buildings. They were supported, he thought, unanimously by their own supporters and the members of the Opposition with regard to this question then. It was well known that that scheme could not be carried out for the amount that was voted for the purpose. The Government since had been accused of abdicating their functions by getting one of their friends to make a motion such as this for the mere purpose of entrapping members of the Opposition. He thought the Government were right in pursuing a cautious policy, because it involved the expenditure of a large amount of money. Their policy had been declared and

WAS WELL UNDERSTOOD,

and the fact of the member for Hamilton bringing in this motion was no indication that the Government were fishing to discover the views of the House. But even if they were, he asked if

they were doing wrong. He held that they were bound to get the views of the House upon any question of importance such as this. On the other hand, the Opposition had a divided policy with regard to this matter. While the member for East Toronto was in favour of the erection of new buildings, and he believed would sincerely co-operate with the Government, the policy of the leader of the Opposition was against the erection of new buildings when he was in the west. He (Mr. Waters) at the first meeting during the last election in his own riding, had the honour of meeting that hon. gentleman, and he held forth strongly the fact that he (Mr. Waters) had supported the erection of new buildings.

Mr. MORRIS stated that he was going to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Bruce, and repeated his statement that the Government were fully charged with the responsibility. Constitutionally the leader of the Opposition had taken the proper course.

Mr. MURRAY did not know what scheme would suit the Opposition unless the Government had gone so far as to have let the contracts and only proposed to allow the House to vote the money. He defended the Government from the charges of cowardice and of shirking responsibility. He did not see how either of these charges could fitly fall upon the Government, as they had done all that could be done. Representing a rural constituency, he would go as far as \$750,000 or \$800,000 for the purposes of new Parliament Buildings.

Mr. CLANCY ventured the assertion that if the erection of new Parliament Buildings were one from which the Government could get glory in the Province, they would not let the Opposition take any of it. In a word the Opposition was asked to sign a blank cheque, while there should be a clear and definite plan before the House.

Mr. AWREY—The present question is one which ought not to be approached from a party standpoint, or with personal feelings. Representing a rural constituency, yet I have sufficient faith in the intelligence of my constituents to believe that they are prepared to sanction the erection of new buildings—buildings suitable for the wants of the Province, and commensurate with the importance of Ontario. Hence I give my assent to the proposition now before the House. I believe that the Legislature in 1880 gave a proposition of the kind now before the House, when the leader of the Opposition took the ground that the people had been consulted, and that they should be consulted. Since that time they have been consulted, and as the people can only give their opinion through their representatives, then the Government is right in taking this manner of ascertaining what the wish of the people is. I believe there is a consensus of opinion in the Province that it is necessary to construct new buildings. I believe that these buildings are not a credit to the Province of Ontario, for Provinces with far less resources, in a much poorer

FINANCIAL POSITION,

and having no such influence in the affairs of the Dominion, have buildings which reflect credit upon them and Canada. Ontario alone of all the others able to build a suitable Parliament House, alone financially unembarrassed, alone with a surplus, the most energetic, with the prospect of an increased revenue from enlarged territories, certainly this Province is entitled to buildings of creditable proportions and architectural beauty. The charge has been made that the Government has abnegated its functions, but this should not be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, for if we look at the Government at Ottawa we shall find that when it comes to the submission of an Insolvency Law, affecting the whole Dominion, and dealing with the interests of all our merchants, the question is referred to a committee. And so upon the Boundary report and the License question, those were submitted to a committee, and we have never heard from hon. members opposite that the Government has abnegated its functions in this respect. This Government must assume the responsibility of the matter; the scheme must be submitted to the House on the responsibility of the Government, and every member of the House who votes for the motion will be quite as free to criticize the plan as if he voted against it. The resolution in my mind does not express the position any too strongly, and I don't think that anyone who has read it carefully and is expressing his honest conviction upon it, can refuse to vote for it.

Mr. BASKERVILLE thought there was necessity for new buildings and the present time a good one to build them, but still the resolution should come from the Government. He was afraid that if the Opposition voted for the resolution they would leave themselves open to the same taunts which had been heaped upon them with respect to the Boundary resolution.

Mr. McMAHON could quite understand the position of the members for Toronto, and he would not be surprised at them being highly pleased in supporting a vote for \$500,000 more than has already been voted. They all knew that new Parliament Buildings were necessary. Taking everything into consideration he should support the amendment by the member for Bruce.

Mr. WHITE took five years ago the position that he was about to take now, namely, that the rural constituencies are not favourable to the project of new Parliament Buildings and that the people should be consulted before new buildings should be erected.