

question of Upper Canada College, he was not going to enter into that. There would be some difference of opinion in the House as to the abolition of that Institution, and he did not intend to discuss it now. The question is, do we require new Parliament Buildings? And he thought that the House was quite willing to assent to this. Dealing with the question of the erection of a Crown Lands vault, he showed that there was imperative need of a fireproof building for the whole Department, as all the books, records, maps, &c., were equally valuable, needed equal protection, and that it would be impossible to expect that every day the books and documents used could be placed in one fireproof receptacle for the night. After alluding to the incongruity there would be between a new west wing and the main building, he expressed the opinion that the people generally, even the leader of the Opposition, were convinced that new buildings were needed.

Mr. WOOD thought new buildings were necessary, because he believed the present ones were not suitable for the Departments nor safe for the documents kept therein. The rooms were not sufficiently comfortable for those who were compelled to spend their time in them. Then he did not think they were sufficiently comfortable for the Legislature. He objected to them also because they were discreditable to the Province. He did not think that the sum proposed was excessive. Although he came from a rural constituency, in which there were no large towns, he did not believe he would find five men in that constituency who would object to his action

IN SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL

to erect new buildings. The intelligence of the people he believed was too great to allow them to be led away by specious arguments. He saw no cause for delay, and on all these grounds cordially supported the resolution. He, however, agreed with his leader that the time had come for the abolition of Upper Canada College. He gave as a reason why he opposed the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Gibson's) proposition, because it dealt with an abstract matter.

Mr. CLARKE, with reference to the site, said that matter was thoroughly discussed by the people of Toronto, and all the objections raised to its being given for Parliament Buildings that could be urged in 1850, but the Council almost unanimously decided in favour of giving the site. In supporting the resolution he said he would have been prepared to support the Government even if they had proposed an expenditure of two millions, and he believed the country would have supported them also.

Mr. WATERS said he thought the scheme was one that would recommend itself to the House. He could hardly understand the position taken by the leader of the Opposition that an expenditure of \$25,000 for a fire-proof building for the Crown Lands Department was all that was required in view of the fact that new Parliament Buildings would have to be erected in any event at some not distant day, and that, therefore, this expenditure would be useless. He was entirely in accord with the resolution.

Hon. C. F. FRASER pointed out that the argument of the leader of the Opposition against the site in Queen's Park, in the interests of the city, was entirely done away with by the statement of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that at the time this matter was up before the people of Toronto were almost unanimously in favour of that site, and he (Mr. Fraser) contended that the Park would be materially improved by the erection of those buildings. With reference to the abolition of Upper Canada College, he maintained that when that question came to be dealt with it should be considered on its merits, and not mixed up with this or any other matter.

Mr. WHITE was strongly against the proposed site, and advocated choosing that now occupied by Upper Canada College.

Mr. MERRICK asked if the Government were prepared to allow the House to vote first on the proposition to choose that site.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said they would not, as it would involve a very much larger expenditure than was now proposed.

A division was then taken on the motion to go into Committee on the resolution, with the following result:—

YEAS—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Baskerville, Baxter, Bishop, Bizard, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Clarke (Toronto), Cook, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Fell, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gillies, Gould, Graham, Gray, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Laidlaw, Lees, McIntyre, MacKenzie, McLaughlin, McMahon, Master, Metcalfe, Morris, Mowat, Murray, Neelon, Pardee, Phelps, Rayside, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdfield, Wood, Young—50.

NAYS—Messrs. Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Creighton, Denison, Ermatinger, French, Hammeil, Hart, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, McColman, McGhee, McKay, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morgan, Mulholland, O'Connor, Preston, Ross (Cornwall), White, Wilmot—26.

The House went into Committee, Mr. Baxter in the chair.

Hon. C. F. FRASER moved that the sum of \$750,000 should be substituted for \$500,000.

Mr. MEREDITH advocated the removal of the Education Department from the Normal School Buildings to the new Parliament Buildings when they were completed.

Hon. C. F. FRASER opposed this on the ground that the present place was more conve-

nient to all connected with the Department, and all who had business with it.

Mr. MERRICK urged the Upper Canada College grounds being utilized for the new Parliament Buildings.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that was impossible and absurd on account of the extra cost it would involve.

Hon. G. W. ROSS, replying to the leader of the Opposition, pointed out the inconsistency of his favouring the separation of politics and education, and then arguing in favour of having the departments in the same building.

Mr. YOUNG said that instead of the new buildings being an injury to the Park they would be an ornamentation to it. The site of Upper Canada College would be a very improper site because of its being on the leading business street and of the certainty that in a few years it would be surrounded by warehouses.

Mr. CREIGHTON said it was a queer objection to say that the buildings would be on a public street if built on the present site of Upper Canada College. This site would be more convenient for the people coming from the country. It would be convenient to the hotels. He thought it was a great mistake to put them away up in the Park. The Parliament Buildings in Ottawa were on a business street.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—That is not a business street.

Mr. CREIGHTON—Well, it is the next street to the principal street of the city. In Chicago the buildings were in the business part of the city.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said that if he looked at the future of the city the Park would be the centre of it. In a few years the business would all go in that direction.

The motion was carried and the Committee rose and reported.

THE BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRASER introduced a Bill to amend the Act of 1830, for the Erection of Parliament Buildings. He explained that the only amendment was as to the amount of the appropriation, which would be changed from \$500,000 to \$750,000. With the consent of the House the Bill was read the first and second time.

PRIVATE ASYLUMS.

The House went into Committee, Mr. Ferris in the chair, on Mr. Hardy's Bill to make further provisions respecting Private Asylums for Insane Persons. The Committee rose and reported the Bill with a few amendments. The Bill was referred back to Committee to come up for its third reading to-morrow.

It being six the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

The House went into Committee, Mr. Baxter in the chair. The following Private Bills were moved a stage:—

Mr. Gray—Respecting the village of Parkdale. At his suggestion, with the consent of the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee the 5th clause, which had been struck out, was re-inserted. It empowers the village Council to pass a by-law providing for the raising of a sum of \$1,643 by taxation for defraying the cost of street improvements done at the Great Western Station over three years ago, the by-law through remissness on the part of the Council not having been passed at the time.

Mr. Cooke—To legalize and confirm an agreement between the town of Ingersoll and the North and West Oxford Agricultural Society.

NIAGARA FALLS RAILWAY.

Mr. SILLS moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Niagara Falls Railway Company.

Mr. MEREDITH said this was an important matter, as it affected the proposed public park scheme at the Falls. The effect of it would be to give a valuable franchise to this railway company, and in the event of the Government's park scheme being carried out it would be necessary to purchase that franchise. He hoped the Government would induce those gentlemen who were promoting the measure to withdraw it on the understanding that if the Government or some private company did not undertake the park scheme this railway company would have the first right to receive a charter.

Hon. O. MOWAT said the Bill was in a very different form now to what it was when introduced, and the objections which applied to it then would not apply now. The negotiations which had been in progress between this Government and the Dominion with reference to the establishment of a public park were at an end, and there was no prospect of their being renewed. The Bill as it now stood, a gentleman with whom he consulted, and who had no interest in either this Bill or the one for the improvement and restoration of the scenery about the Falls, told him that there could not be any impropriety in allowing it to pass. The point mentioned as that at which this railway was to end was a considerable distance from the territory intended for the park, and the opinion was that the park would not be interfered with by it. Learning that opinion, he withdrew the objections which he had to this Bill in the first place.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) said if he had thought his name was destined to receive the amount of attention from the public that it had he did not think it would have appeared in connection with this scheme at all. However, he was convinced

that this was a matter so far as it affected public interests affected them favourably. There was a petition in favour of the Bill signed by a very large number living in the locality, including the majority of the Town Council of Niagara Falls, and it affirmed that the work proposed would not in any way affect or mar the scenery of the river. From his own knowledge of the locality he was satisfied that this was the case. It was intended that the railway should be started at a point below the lower Suspension Bridge, while the territory proposed as a park was not intended to come below the Clifton House, so that the park would not be interfered with at all. He maintained that the railway would be in the public interest because it would afford facilities of witnessing the points of interest along the river between the lower bridge and the Village of Queenston. The opposition arose from this argument, that a park might be formed and that this Bill might give a franchise that those who might at some time organize a park company might attach some value to. He could not help observing, and he thought he was justified in stating that the opposition to this Bill had emanated from one source alone—the Canada Southern Railway Company. If any one was going to be affected by this Bill it was this Company, because this railway would compete with the Canada Southern in taking the summer traffic from Toronto to the Falls. A certain promoter of the park scheme happened to be the solicitor of the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the objections to this Bill, if not emanating exclusively through that source, did so almost entirely.

Mr. MEREDITH read a petition from the town of Niagara Falls in favour of the establishment of a public park, to secure unrestricted access to the Falls, and against the Bill.

Mr. AWREY contended that the petition had been gotten up after the strenuous exertion of the Canada Southern Railway Company. He stated that the inhabitants of the neighbourhood were largely in favour of the Bill, and that a large majority of them had signed petitions in favour of the railway scheme.

Mr. MERRICK said the whole Province was concerned in the project. No harm could be done by the postponement of the Bill for twelve months.

Mr. FERRIS said there was a consensus of opinion expressed in the Committee that the park should not be held in the hands of a private party. He thought, therefore, that all facilities for reaching there should be obtained one way or another, and that the time of monopoly should cease. He was opposed to the idea that cabs should be the only means of getting there and he supported the project of the railway.

Mr. WHITE suggested delay in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE pointed out that there were petitions from both sides and read one in favour of the railway from the town of Niagara Falls signed by the mayor, several councillors, and others, and two other petitions from the same place also in favour of the Bill. He pointed out that the railway would not interfere with the park project, and that in case a Park Company was organized it could acquire the franchise of the railway. He suggested that the Bill should be allowed to go to a second reading.

The Bill was read a second time.

THE STUDY OF ANATOMY.

Mr. BAXTER moved the second reading of the Bill regarding the study of Anatomy. He thought it was the duty of the House to see that there was a legitimate way for medical students to procure material for the study of anatomy, as most stringent examination was required of them. There was a bill in operation in Quebec similar to the present, and there ought to be no reason why the Bill should not pass. He was satisfied from extensive inquiries that the Bill was needed. He moved that it be read a second time, and referred to a special committee.

Mr. YOUNG would not like the Bill to be read a second time without saying a few words about it. If the Bill passed in its present state there would be a great commotion in the country. He pointed out that by a provision of the Bill if a man were found dead and not claimed by relatives within 48 hours the body could be claimed under the Bill. He thought that any person should be allowed to claim the bodies.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN pointed out that no student could obtain a certificate to practice until he had dissected every part of the human body. It was inconsistent that the House should demand this and then refuse means for obtaining material for dissection. He contended that if Mr. Young's views were carried out it would be impossible to obtain bodies.

The Bill was read the second time.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr. WOOD moved the second reading of the Bill to provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day by prohibiting Sunday excursions of a certain kind. He took the ground that railway excursions should be prohibited on Sunday because they interfered with the peace of people who wished to observe the day in a Christian manner. He thought that that Commandment which said "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy," should be adhered to as much as any other part of the Decalogue. He pointed out that the churches and leading men of different societies were in favour of the prohibition of Sunday excursions. He admitted that there was an anomaly in the