

Hon. Mr. WOOD moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. Carried.

On the vote of \$695,521 51 for public works and buildings,

On the item of \$190,205 92 for London Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. BLAKE asked whether it was expected that the whole of this sum would be expended during the ensuing year.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said he expected that it would. The Asylum would be prepared ready for admittance of inmates in November. It was to great extent, a revote.

Mr. BLAKE said that the vote last Session was \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting a building to contain 200 inmates, which was ultimately to accommodate 500 patients, but the understanding was that their vote should be taken, and should be expended in the erection of a building to accommodate 200 patients at a cost of \$100,000. That was the statement made by the hon. Treasurer in his last financial statement.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said the hon. gentleman was correct in what he stated in regard to his statement.

Mr. BLAKE said that was the understanding; but before the House met the sum of \$225,000 had been contracted for instead of \$100,000. This circumstance indicated still more forcibly the propriety of the House insisting upon authentic information as to the intention of the Government as to these matters, which could only be obtained by the Government laying their plans before the House before they asked us to vote. He thought it was important to the House that before it entered into contracts for expenditure, and that before the Government took upon themselves to pledge the public credit to a larger amount than the estimates of the year, that they should have the plans and estimates. But what was due in this case? The statement was that about 200 acres were to be bought, and that the expenditure was to be \$100,000, \$10,000 of which were for the land, and \$90,000 for the expenditure on an Asylum to accommodate 200 patients. He asked for a return at the earlier stages of this session of all plans and estimates; but the only estimates he found were given after date of his notice, by the architect to the Commissioner to the effect that this work would be done at \$500 per inmate, making a total of \$250,000 for the 500 inmates. That was the only estimate made by the Government of this work. Now, he thought it was proper that other estimates of a different character should have been entered into, and that more information should have been obtained by the Government, which would have enabled the House to judge of the contracts, and of the cost of the ground, and other incidents of the work. What had been done? The contract had been let for a comparatively small sum, and, from good opinion—not from an inhabitant of London, nor of a disappointed contractor—he believed that many of the works, and particularly the interior walls of the building, had been constructed in the most inferior way possible. Under the elastic estimate of \$500 per patient, the Government had bought an additional 100 acres of land, had made a separate residence for the Superintendent, which was not originally intended. It seemed to him that to apply the term estimate to such a statement was farcical, and only served to mislead as to the probable cost of the work. With reference to the site of the Asylum, he was told that it was very springy, for the drainage of the farm cost \$3,000 for its 200 acres, and that not sub-soil, but in freeing the land from springs. He accused the Government of short sightedness in their management of the affair, and that they had bought the land and commenced the Asylum, and after they found that it was marshy they determined in October that they should buy another 100 acres.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said they got it cheaper than in the spring.

Mr. BLAKE—I do not know that; but I am aware that you gave \$9,000 for one 100 acres, which would not realize \$4,000 in cash.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD—I assert the contrary.

Mr. BLAKE—The hon. member may do so, of course; he is interested in the matter. The hon. Atty. General had had some experience in selling land—at Chatham, for instance—and although he got what he asked for it, it was what he asked last, and not what he had asked in the first instance. He held that if the 100 acres of land was wanted it ought to have been obtained, and not after the commencement of the Asylum.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said he believed the plans would have been laid before the House if desired.

Mr. BLAKE said a motion to have them laid before the House had been voted down.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said the plans could be seen at the Department of Public Works if the hon. member wished to see them. It was proposed to build a small Asylum, to accommodate six or seven hundred patients. Such a building would cost about \$1,000 per patient. The Toronto Asylum cost about \$600,000. With respect to the purchasing of the additional lot, the utilizing of the labour of the patients would more than repay its cost. The objections urged by the hon. member for Bruce were unfounded, untenable and without any weight.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD said the objection of the hon. member opposite, as to the large sum required, was the only one which had the appearance of being reasonable. It might be urged that the expending of such a large sum of money at once would increase the burden of taxation on the country. But that objection would have no weight, when it was considered that there was a large surplus in the Public Treasury. With respect to the purchasing of the additional 100 acres, the honourable member had taken occasion to charge the Government with want of foresight in not buying the lot before it was proposed to erect the Asylum there. Now, the facts were that an offer had been made to purchase the lot before it became known where the asylum was to be erected. The owner asked no less than \$100 per acre for it. The lot was subsequently purchased for \$90. And he considered it a cheap bargain, for, as the hon. Treasurer said, he believed the labor of the patients

could be so utilized by means of the addition as to make the institution self-sustaining.

Mr. BLAKE—Hear, hear!

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD meant to say he hoped the institution would be made self-sustaining. Not only in the purchase of the lot had great economy been shown, but in the construction of the buildings and the general management of the affairs connected with it, the utmost care had been taken to secure good work at the cheapest rate.

Mr. CUMBERLAND said the hon. member for Bruce had been so badly in need of something on which to found a charge against Government, that he demanded the minor details connected with the proposed work. He (Mr. C.) did not consider this the function of the Administration. The Government had so far succeeded in keeping the expenses within the limits of the estimates. These unfair, querulous objections were discouraging to the Government, and were calculated to effect no good. The sole desire of the hon. members opposite was to throw unjust suspicion on the Government, and to try to take out of the hands of the Administration of the day the responsibility of their actions.

Mr. BLAKE rose to meet a statement made by the hon. member for Algoma. That hon. member had spoken of the economy of the Government, and the manner in which the estimates were kept within bounds. Now, the fact was, that this one item alone was \$90,000 more than the estimate for last year. The hon. Treasurer stated this evening that the Asylum could be erected for \$1,000 per patient. Last session, he proposed to erect the Asylum for \$500 per patient.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said that mistake had been publicly corrected last year. The hon. member for Bruce had taken it upon himself to ensure the construction of this work without knowing anything about it. In his sweeping censure he accused everyone connected with it, from the Government down to the labourers on the building. The hon. member had taken occasion to speak disparagingly of the work on mere rumour. He seemed to desire to poison the public mind by these unfounded statements. Such a course was most unjustifiable, and was without precedent. He (Mr. W.) believed if the work could be completed at half the cost—if the Government lived on bread and cheese, and carried the cost themselves—they paid the entire cost out of their own pockets, the hon. member for Bruce would still be dissatisfied with the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman could find nothing to satisfy him. The ground was springy, and the work was imperfectly done. It was most annoying to the Government, after all the anxiety, after all the care which they had bestowed on the work, to find fault found with everything they had done. It seemed impossible to please the hon. member, do what they could.

Mr. BLAKE said he was not going to give the name of his informant, but his opinion of him was such that he ventured to say that they were true. His informant was not a resident at London, and not a contractor; but he at his request visited the building and he received from him an account, and he was quite aware of the responsibility that a member of the House took in making these charges. The letter stated

"The foundation only is of rubble or common masonry; the superstructure of the commonest white brick used in London. The stone is of very poor quality, being all of a thin slaty kind of limestone beplastered, not pointed, with very poor mortar. All the mortar for stone and brick seems to have been made with a reddish kind of sand got in the locality and not washed. That kind of pit sand is full of earthy particles (which gives the colouring.) This prevents the proper crystallizing or hardening of the mortar. In every good building such sand is required to be washed to run off the earth. I never saw any brickwork so very carelessly done, especially the interior walls.

"The material appears to have been thrown together pell-mell without regard to anything but the altitude attained. The bond is excessively bad. The elevation of a wall inside showing a perpendicular joint extending very frequently from three to ten courses without any break. I observed, also, that in some of the main walls inside there was only one bond course in twelve feet across the wall.

"The wall is a brick and a half, and usually there should be a heading course every four or five courses of stretcher courses, in alternate sides. As it is the wall could be split laterally for want of this bond, and the want of the proper bond works, first mentioned, makes it equally weak longitudinally.

"It is true that while the foundation stands, and the joints are in the walls, they cannot well fall, and the plastering will cover all defects; but the fact remains that the walls are built with the greatest carelessness.

"The foundations are all firm so far as I know.

"The window frames are very plain and simple in the plan, and nothing could be coarser in execution.

"The lumber is the commonest kind, full of large and loose knots, many of which have fallen out. The only other dressed lumber I saw was some stuff for the cornice. It was also very rough stuff."

Atty. General MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman was responsible for the remarks of the letter. A portion of it has been sent to a newspaper.

Mr. BLAKE—I has never been seen by other eyes than mine.

Atty. General MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman ought to have called a Committee to enquire into these circumstances. He branded the individual who wrote the letter as a slanderer.

Mr. BLAKE—Brand me instead.

Atty. General MACDONALD said that the charges were not true, and the hon. member did not dare disclose the name.

Mr. BLAKE was perfectly willing to bear the responsibility.

Mr. EVANS said he had not visited the Asylum since the work had been commenced, so that he could not speak positively as to the manner in which it was conducted. A more eligible site might have been chosen for

the building. One of the young Hall's had a house, near the site, on a rising ground, which would have been better. However, there could not be so much fault found with the site. With regard to the price paid for the additional farm, he considered it very high. He was prepared to say that twice the amount which should have been paid, had been given for it. (Hear, hear) He had heard that the former proprietor had paid \$9,500 for it. He (Mr. Evans) had worked on the farm; and, speaking from his personal knowledge, he could say that it was a light, poor, sandy, farm.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Did you see the house on it.

Mr. EVANS—No, I did not.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—But there is a house on it.

Mr. EVANS—No, there isn't.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—There is a brick house on it.

Mr. EVANS—I beg your pardon, there isn't. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. WOOD—"Well, there is a comfortable house on it, with a brick foundation."

Mr. EVANS—"I believe there is a small house on it worth about \$400." (Laughter) He was not sorry to hear that the former owner of the farm had got rid of it on such good terms. He heartily rejoiced at the success of that gentleman, but considered that Government paid pretty dear for their whistle. (Laughter.) With regard to the general work of the building, he of course, could say nothing, not having seen it himself, but he was informed by builders that it was very imperfectly done. This was not the opinion of interested parties—not the opinion of unsuccessful builders, who had tendered for the work, but of men who had no interest in misrepresenting the actual condition of the affair. He had seen the material for the buildings, and could speak of it from his own observation. The stone was from St. Mary's quarry, and was shabby; the sand (and he had seen a great many loads of it passing up to the work) was of the very poorest description. He had never seen such sand used in the construction of a building before. It was just such sand as was described in the letter read by the hon. member for South Bruce. Now, if this sand were used, the building could not be a good one. He would not say much about the drainage. A good deal had been said about it, and he was prepared to say that a good deal of dissatisfaction existed with regard to it. In his humble opinion there was a little more attention paid to throwing little chances in the way of political friends than to selecting a suitable site for the building.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said it was very unfair for the hon. member for South Bruce and the hon. member for the County of Middlesex to denounce the work, when neither of them had seen it.

Mr. EVANS said the hon. member would remember that he said nothing with regard to the work (so far as his own personal observations were concerned), but the materials he had seen going there.

Hon. Mr. CARLING could only say that the Architect—the experienced Architect who had the charge of a great many of the public buildings in this country, had examined the Asylum, and reported that the work was well done, the material was the right kind of material, and instead of the sand being of a poor kind it was of the very best. He (Mr. C.) thought an Architect like Mr. Tully, who had been connected with the public buildings for the last twenty years ought to be as good a judge of such matters as the hon. member for South Bruce, or the hon. member for E. Middlesex. He (Mr. C.) had examined the work himself, and he felt satisfied that the work was well done and good material used. He went over the works with an experienced builder, and asked him if these charges were true, and he replied that the work was as well done as any he had ever seen.

Mr. BLAKE—My hon. friend does not clear up the matter about this building on the Brodie farm.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said the farm was obtained at a very reasonable rate—\$57 per acre. With regard to the Briary farm, he would be quite willing to take it at the price which had been paid for it, and would consider he had made a profitable speculation. (Hear, hear) He considered it well worth the price which had been paid for it.

Mr. BLAKE—But the house?

Hon. Mr. CARLING said there was a very good, comfortable house on the lot.

Mr. BLAKE—What kind of a house?

Hon. Mr. CARLING said it was a house with a brick foundation, (laughter,) and was worth about \$1,000.

Hon. Mr. WOOD wished to know if the gentleman from whom the hon. member for South Bruce received that letter was a politician.

Mr. BLAKE—Every man in this country is a politician. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Yes; but what side is he on? (Cries of six o'clock.)

The House rose at six o'clock.

After recess,

Mr. COYNE called attention to the omission of the Hamilton and Port Dover Railway Company from the order of the day. It had been reported by the Committee, and he claimed that it should be now proceeded with. The delay would prejudice the Bill.

Some slight conversation ensued, and the matter eventually dropped.

SUPPLY.

The Committee on Supply resumed.

On the vote of \$26,132 94 for the Toronto Asylum.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said, in reply to Mr. Boyd, that furniture, &c., was purchased in the usual method. The present Government had made no purchases.

On the vote of \$40,719 90 for the Deaf and Dumb Institution.

The above votes were agreed to.

ASYLUM FOR THE BLIND.

On the vote of \$75,000 for an Asylum for the Blind,

Mr. BOYD called the attention of the Attorney General to a motion which he had moved in 1856, when in Opposition, to the

effect that it was not expedient that sums should be expended without the Government placing some information with respect to the purpose before the House. But now he saw that \$75,000 was to be voted for an Asylum for the blind, and no member on this side of the House objected to the expenditure. But they wished for further information as to locality, and cost, and estimates. He thought that the House ought to know the manner in which this large sum of money was to be expended.

Atty. General MACDONALD said the resolution was passed under different circumstances. The Government at that time was an extravagant one; but they could not say that the present Government erred on that score. The vote he had given had some justification, and the hon. gentleman ought to know that it was very inexpedient to publish the selected locality before they had obtained the land. The result would be that the price would be vastly enhanced immediately. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Evans) had voted against the leader of the Opposition in his charge against the Government in reference to the lunatic institution, yet he now came forward and said that the building was a disgrace in the way it had been erected. He did not think that the hon. members opposite did credit to themselves by the course pursued.

Mr. MCKELLAR said that it was amusing to witness the attempts of the hon. Atty. General to make his vote of 1856 agree with his conduct now. The Government had denied them any information last session, and he repeated his conduct on the present occasion. He thought the House ought to be informed of the proposed situation of the Asylum. The Attorney General implied that they were right because they had a majority. The Opposition were in a minority; but that did not make them wrong; but the hon. Atty. General had himself been in a minority for many years, and if they accepted his argument that those in the minority were wrong in consequence of their lesser number, then the Atty. General must admit that he had himself been in error for many years. But he did not think that principle was changed by the numbers that supported it; and he hoped that the hon. member for Prescott would press his motion on the proper occasion.

Mr. HAYS said, on the part of his county, he would make them an offer of a free grant of 600 acres, in the best position in Canada, in Huron.

Mr. BLAKE said the hon. member for Huron was a young politician, or he would have added the number of votes that the district would give the Government, for it would depend upon that consideration whether the district should have the favour or not.

Mr. WALLIS said the city of Toronto would also be very glad to get the Asylum. The vote was then agreed to.

On the vote of \$33,001 83, for the Government House,

Mr. MCKELLAR asked whether this would cover the whole cost?

Hon. Mr. CARLING said that it would. The cost of the stable was \$4,350, and not \$5,000, as is supposed.

After some remarks from Mr. Swinarton, the vote was agreed to.

The vote of \$5,000 for the Reformatory at Peretanguishene was next agreed to, after some discussion.

Court House and Gaol, Sault Ste. Marie—\$2,500. Agreed to.

Lock on Rosseau River, Muskoka, \$28,046 14.

Hon. Mr. WOOD, in answer to cries of "explain," said the contract was given out on the 25th of May, and the total expenditure for the year was nearly \$7,000. It was thought that the work might have been completed during one summer, but it had not been done. It was wholly expected, when this vote was taken, that the money would have been expended, and no credit was taken for economy, when the money had not been expended.

The vote was then agreed to.

On the vote of \$19,244 55, for lock at Young's Point,

Mr. HAYS said these votes seem all to go to the West. (Laughter.)

Mr. WOOD—But you have the Improvement Fund.

The vote was then agreed to.

Lock between Bertram and Cameron Lakes, \$19,244 55; agreed to.

Improvement of Navigation on Scugog River, \$21,000.

Mr. BLAKE enquired when this money was proposed to be expended?

Hon. Mr. CARLING said the expenditure of the \$21,000 upon these works could take place next summer.

The vote was then agreed to.

On the vote of \$10,000 for a cut between Lakes Joseph and Rosseau, and \$25,000 for a new road between Washago and Gravenhurst,

Mr. BLAKE asked if this were the end of the chain.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said it was.

Mr. BEATTY asked if the road was to be over the same line as the old one. He thought it would be better that the road should be macadamized.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said it was a plank road over the route of the old one, but straighter. It would cost \$10,000 to make a gravel road, and he was instructed that the plank road when decayed formed a good bed for a gravel road.

Mr. BEATTY thought that it would be better to make the road of gravel at the outset.

Hon. Mr. CARLING said the idea was that the road would not be completed next season if it was made of gravel, which would not be the case if made of wood. They wished to see the road ready next season.

Mr. HAYS moved that the item be struck out. He saw that a large amount of money had been expended last year in favour of this district, and further expenditure was now proposed. He did not think that they should treat them in a different manner to that which the district he represented had received.