

Mr. MEREDITH had no hesitation in repeating his statement as to his position that when the Government came down with a definite proposition he would give it a fair consideration on its merits.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Several members of the Opposition have given us their reasons for voting against the motion. I can well understand the position of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. White). His ground is a straight, plain, and square dissent from the motion. He does not believe that new Parliament Buildings are necessary, and even if he had any opinion that they are necessary he would still contend that the people should be consulted before he would commit himself so far as voting for a motion of this kind. I say I can quite understand that position. I can understand any member acting in that manner who thinks the present buildings are fitted for the wants of the Government and Parliament, considers them suitable for the rank of the Province, and who wants no better. I can fully understand a member having these views calling upon members who think differently, who think that the present buildings are not suitable to the Province, are unhealthy, and not adequate to the wants of the Government, to give place to him, and allow him to come on this side of the House. But I didn't think he was going to give notice of ejection on such a ground, because the first member it would reach would be the member for Toronto

East (Mr. Morris); then he would next reach the member for Toronto West (Mr. Clarke), in the same way, and he, in effect, tells these gentlemen to get on; it is healthy enough for us, and it ought to be healthy enough for you, and if you think differently, then you have no part with us." And so with my hon. friends, the member for West York (Mr. Gray), and the member for the Limstone City (Mr. Metcalfe). I want to call attention to a notice of motion which has been given by a prominent member of the Opposition, and I want to say that hon. gentlemen in opposing the motion before the House are putting

#### RODS IN PICKLE

for themselves; they are hatching out constitutional chickens which will come home to roost. Their leader asks them to say "nay" to this motion—not because he is opposed to it on principle, but on the ground that it is an abstract proposition, and that the House ought not to be called on to pronounce upon an abstract proposition until the Government comes down with a definite plan. Now, let us see how that would work here. I think my hon. friend, the member for Dundas, has in his mind to ask the House in some way to express its opinion upon an abstract proposition; just in the same manner as this motion we are now debating, and as to which the Government will have the same responsibility as this.

Mr. MEREDITH—No, no.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Well let us see whether it is so or not. It is his intention to ask the House to vote upon this:—"That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the Government should make some suitable recognition to the Volunteers of 1837-38, residing in the Province of Ontario, for the valuable services they rendered in defence of their country at that time." He not only puts upon record an abstract proposition, but says that the Government ought to assume the responsibility of pronouncing upon a plan before it is submitted to them. He will ask the Government to pronounce upon that. If that motion is carried public money would be spent. And if the motion before the House is passed there will not be any money spent till the scheme is brought down, a plan formulated,

#### AND RESPONSIBILITY ASSUMED

by the Government. Yet while he asked those sitting on the Treasury benches to vote for his motion, he says, "I am not prepared to deal with your plan until all the details of the scheme are before me." I would like to know how the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) is going to reconcile that resolution of his with his attitude to-day. Then there is my hon. friend the member for North Hastings (Mr. Wood), who admits that the buildings are not in keeping with the character of the Province, but says that this is an abstract question. He does not know what is the intention of the Government, that the Government should assume entire responsibility and that they should not ask the House to vote upon the motion. Yet he proposes to ask the opinion of the House upon a proposition of this kind; it is desirable, in view of the much larger rate paid by school sections in new parts of the Province than by those in older parts, that further provision should be made, based on some regular system for relief of said newer sections. He tells us "I am not prepared to vote for the motion before the House, because the Government has not announced any plan," and yet he will ask the House to vote upon that resolution. How perfectly absurd it will be for him to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for London! Therefore I tell him that the constitutional chickens will come to roost, and that his leader

#### IS GUIDING HIM IN BAD WAYS

and devious paths. We have read in the newspapers what the Parliament at Ottawa have been discussing. They were discussing the abstract question of compensation to distillers and brewers, and that is a question very much larger and more responsible in the way of money than this, and yet

no member of the House has said that the House is not at liberty—without knowing what the plans of the Government are—to discuss the proposition. If this motion is amended as proposed by the amendment, it will read:—"That in the opinion of this House the present Parliament and Departmental Buildings are not unfit for occupation by the Legislature, are not inadequate to the requirements of the Public Service, are in keeping with the resources and position of Ontario as the premier Province of the Dominion, and that this House is not prepared to consider any reasonable scheme for the erection of new Parliament Buildings." Now, I wish the hon. gentlemen joy of their vote, I wish them joy of their vote which will stultify them, and go against their conviction. Let those do so who choose. Let gentlemen who are not prepared to express in a fair and straightforward manner their honest convictions, vote for the amendment of the hon. member for London. As for the responsibility; the entire responsibility will remain where it ought to—on the Government after the House expresses its opinion. But it does not follow that even if this resolution is carried the House will ever consent to the erection of new Parliament Buildings.

Mr. MEREDITH—Hear, hear.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—The hon. gentleman may say hear, hear. But suppose this resolution is carried, it does not absolutely follow that anything will directly follow. We are not going to get by it a blank cheque, and we will not be entitled to take any definite step under this resolution until we first come to the House and say here is a

#### A DEFINITE PLAN

and scheme for the erection of these buildings. Then for the first time the House will be called upon to consider this question in its details, and the ways and means.

Mr. MEREDITH—Why do you want the motion carried?

Hon. C. F. FRASER—As far as the responsibility of the Government is concerned it makes no difference whether the motion is carried or not. I am glad he made the interruption for I can explain our position with respect to this motion. The Government never suggested in any shape or way that this motion should be submitted; we never, either directly or indirectly, suggested that such a resolution should be put upon paper, but even if we had I contend that it would not have been any unusual course of procedure. The Government at Ottawa is in the habit of seeking the opinion of the House in this manner upon questions, and I venture to say that it would not be anything unusual if the Government at Ottawa had sought to obtain the opinion of the House upon the question of compensation to distillers and brewers by a motion by a private member. Let us consider what was done in 1880. A good deal has been said about what was done then, and that it is not necessary to make a new affirmation now that new Parliament Buildings are necessary. In answer to this I say that we have a new House, and what the House might think then it might not think now. After the lapse of five years the Government said not to go on without asking the opinion of the House, when practically nothing has been done in the meantime under its resolution of 1880. Again, when the House has expressed its opinion, will the responsibility be cast on the Government to carry out the wish of the House?

Mr. FRENCH attempted to clear the member for Dundas from the charge of inconsistency in proposing a resolution for an abstract proposition when he refused to vote for the present motion.

#### THE DIVISION.

A division was taken on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. O'Connor with the following result—52 yeas, 30 nays:—

YEAS—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Clarke (Toronto), Cook, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Ferris, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gillies, Gould, Graham, Gray, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Laidlaw, Lees, McIntyre, MacKenzie, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Master, Metcalfe, Morin, Morris, Mowat, Murray, Neelson, O'Connor, Pardec, Phelps, Riverside, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdifield, Young—52.

NAYS—Messrs. Baskerville, Blythe, Brereton, Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Denison, Ermatinger, Fell, French, Hammell, Hart, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, McColman, McGhee, McKay, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morgan, Mulholland, Preston, Robillard, Ross (Cornwall), White, Wilmot, Wood—36.

#### AFTER RECESS.

The House in Committee, Mr. Bxter in the chair.

#### THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT.

Hon. G. W. ROSS—The Bill to consolidate and amend the Public Schools Act, Sections 1 to 8, relating to title, definitions, and being mere consolidation of the existing Acts, were passed. Section 10 is somewhat of a change from the present law inasmuch as it provides that no Section shall be formed which contains less than 50 actual resident children, between the ages of five and twenty-one.

Hon. G. W. ROSS explained that the old law provided for children between the ages of five and sixteen. He was adopting a uniform age through the Bill. The number attending school over sixteen was not very large, and he did not think it would make any inconvenience.

On sections 13 and 14, referring to the qualification of trustees and electors, Hon. G. W. ROSS said he had found there were many excellent trustees and electors along the American border, and that in the rural districts there were many Germans who made useful trustees, and he now proposed to strike out the provision that school trustees and electors must be subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, leaving the clause as they stood in the old law.

Sections 18 to 22 were passed with an amendment in the 21st referring to the form of declaration when a voter is objected to by striking out the 3rd clause, "That I am a subject of Her Majesty either by birth or naturalization."

Section 23 was amended by adding "or any Justice of the Peace," providing that trustees shall make their declaration of office either before the Chairman of the school meeting or any Justice of the Peace."

Section 25 was amended by striking out the words "and of the School Inspector," which makes it only necessary that any trustee of a rural school section may resign with the consent in writing of his colleagues in office.

The Bill was amended to Section 39 and the Committee reported.

The House adjourned at 10:15.