

Department are in every way suitable, and that it will always be an advantage to have the Model and Normal Schools together under one roof, the Education Department should be retained where it is and so save the extra expense. But even if rooms for the Education Department had to be provided for in the new buildings the extra expense would not be very great and would not be sufficient to warrant the House to hesitate in authorizing the amount necessary. It would only require the addition of a few more rooms, and the extra cost would not be at all serious. The Government's proposition is to select one of these two designs. We are now in a position to say with sufficient accuracy what the new buildings built according to either of these designs will cost. When the House asked the Government in 1880 to give an estimate of the cost of the proposed buildings, the Government were not in a position to give

A CORRECT ESTIMATE.

In the estimates which I am now able to lay before the House precautions have been taken that there should be no extras. We asked for tenders for the erection of Buildings according to the two plans which I have mentioned, and I propose to give the House the result of the actual tenders received, so that the House may see that in asking for this sum we are asking for a sum that will be ample for the erection of these buildings upon either one of these plans. For the erection of the Buildings according to the plan of Messrs. Gordon & Helliwell we received ten different tenders from contractors, all of whom were men of experience and all financially able to undertake this work and willing to undertake it, so that they were in every respect the tenders of first-class men.

Mr. CARNEGIE—They will be tendered for again of course?

Mr. FRASER—Oh, yes; and there is every reason to believe that the tenders will be rather less than these. Five of these ten were under the sum of \$600,000. These five were respectively for \$542,000, \$556,000, \$578,000, \$580,000, and \$585,000. I might say here that the name of the gentleman who made this last tender is Mr. Alexander Manning. The three next highest were below \$700,000 being respectively \$617,000, \$619,000, and \$665,000. Two tenders exceeded \$700,000, but none exceeded \$750,000, so that the lowest tender was for \$542,000 and the highest for \$748,000.

Mr. BRODER—Were they all offers based on the same plan?

Mr. FRASER—Yes, as far as I have been able to study this out, these ten were tenders made for the erection of the buildings according to this plan. The other plan received nine tenders, most of which were by the same persons. Three out of the nine exceed \$600,000, a very little. They are respectively, \$612,000, \$626,000, \$626,000. Three others did not exceed \$750,000, they were for \$703,000, \$719,000, and \$750,000. So that six out of the nine tenders for the more expensive design did not exceed \$750,000. The lowest, \$612,000, was by a competent firm able to carry out the work, which would leave a margin from the sum asked of about \$150,000.

An Hon. Member—What was the highest tender for the last plan?

Mr. FRASER—I was forgetting that. The highest tender was \$925,000. The three highest were \$804,000, \$875,000, and \$925,000.

Mr. MEREDITH—How does the hon. gentleman account for this enormous difference?

Mr. FRASER—There always is a great difference. It is one of the experiences of those who are accustomed to receive tenders, that there is the widest difference between the estimates of different persons as to the cost of the work. In all my ten years' experience I have never found it otherwise, except in the case of staple articles, where the tenders are generally close, but for the erection of buildings the differences in the amounts of the tenders are extraordinary. We have invariably given the work to the lowest tender, I am safe in saying, where the lowest tender can be relied upon as safe.

Mr. HARCOURT—What is Mr. Manning's tender on the second set of plans?

Mr. FRASER—\$875,000. These estimates include any necessary leveling and the work of excavating the ground. I think I am right in saying how much these buildings will actually cost the Province. I said they would cost \$750,000, less the selling price of this site. Therefore we require to get at the selling price of this site. Hon. gentlemen who were in this House in 1880 will recollect that I produced an estimate of the value of this site. The figures then ran from an estimate made in 1873 by our own Department, \$300,000, while one gentleman put it at more than half a million of dollars. I think myself this latter sum is too great. There was one gentleman in the city of Toronto who had had great experience who said that, having regard to the situation of this land and the interests of the railway companies, it ought to sell for over half a million if advertised for sale by public auction. These railway companies would be anxious to acquire this block of land and would be willing to give this sum for it. I do not consider it worth this much, but I think that it would bring not less than \$300,000. I put the figures in 1880 at less than \$300,000, but having regard to the changed circumstances, having regard to the fact that the land is now more valuable, having regard to the opinion ex-

pressed by those who put the value upon it then, that the land would increase in value, it is not put at too high a figure to say that this block of land if put into the market would realize \$300,000.

Mr. MORRIS—What does the Assessment Commissioner put upon it?

Hon. C. F. FRASER—The Assessment Commissioner, Mr. Maughan, in 1880 estimated the frontage on Front-street at \$150 per foot, carrying back the lots half the distance to Wellington-street, so as to give the lots an equal depth on the two streets. This would give \$143,500, and the Wellington-street front he placed at \$95,700, making a total of \$239,200, but he added a note to that stating that he believed he was largely within the mark. Mr. Close, in the same year, valued the land at \$237,000, and Mr. McMurray valued this land at a total of \$263,000, so that I am fairly within the mark in stating that \$300,000 can be realized from the present site if it were placed in the market. In addition to that by the Act of 1880 there was set apart to be sold a piece of land in the westerly part of the city, and the proceeds to go towards the erection of new Parliament Buildings. It was estimated then that the land ought to be worth \$2,000 per acre, and if that be so it would realize \$150,000. If I am right in assuming then that the new Parliament Buildings could be erected for \$750,000, that we could sell this site for \$300,000 and the 71 acres of land for \$150,000,

THE REAL COST OF THE NEW BUILDINGS

to the Province would only be \$450,000. I wish this to be remembered, because, although \$750,000 is apparently asked for the erection of the buildings, they will be put up by an actual expenditure of \$300,000. Their cost will be then that sum plus the value of the land in the west. This should be added, because it is really an asset of the Province.

Mr. GRAY—Where is the land situated that you speak of?

Hon. C. F. FRASER—It is south of the Asylum, and part of the land on which the Mercer Institution is erected. Without deducting that the cost would be about \$450,000, or if you deduct the value of that land, which is valueless to the Province as far as it is at present used, the cost would be as I have stated. I think, therefore, under these circumstances the Government may very fairly ask the House, in view of the feeling throughout the Province that these buildings are not such as are suitable to the needs of the Province or bring any credit to the Province—to say that the proposal is one that the House can accept. To show that there is no extravagance in the proposition, I will quote figures which give the cost of State, city, and court house buildings. I need not mention the cost of the Government Buildings at Ottawa, as it would be no fair criterion as to what ought to be spent by the Province, but the small State of Connecticut, has buildings at Hartford, which cost \$2,500,000; the North Carolina State Buildings at Raleigh cost \$530,000; the State of Illinois has buildings at Springfield costing \$3,500,000; the Iowa Buildings at Des Moines, \$1,500,000; Michigan, at Lansing, \$1,505,000; Mississippi, at Jackson, \$600,000. New York State Buildings, I suppose, have been extravagantly expensive, and when one considers the political history of the rings which had to do with some of the public expenditure, we can well realize that the statement of some authorities that they cost \$20,000,000 is not too far out. I don't say that they cost this sum, but that is the amount returned to me as the cost. Then there is the Province of Quebec with all its liabilities, all its outstanding indebtedness, and financial embarrassment (I do not say this in an offensive sense), to-day is erecting new public buildings estimated to cost \$700,000, and some part of them is erected.

Mr. CLARKE—Does the hon. gentleman say \$700,000?

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Yes.

Mr. CLARKE—It must be double that.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Those are the figures sent to me, and, if it is as stated by the hon. gentleman, they only show in stronger light the reasonableness of our proposal. As to the cost of city buildings, which do not compare with Provincial Buildings or those for the States, Baltimore spent \$3,000,000 on hers. Boston City Buildings are said to have cost \$500,000. Buffalo, only a short distance from this city, with a population not a great deal larger than this, has buildings costing \$1,450,000. The City Buildings at Pittsburgh cost \$1,000,000; Philadelphia, \$7,000,000; the Court House at Cincinnati, \$500,000; Court House, St. Louis, \$1,200,000; and the City Hall and Court House at Chicago, \$4,000,000. The Custom House at Boston cost \$1,076,000; Custom House, Chicago, \$4,000,000; the Cooper Institute, New York, erected by private munificence, cost \$600,000; the Treasury Buildings, New York, \$1,750,000; Postoffice and United States Court House, New York, altogether are said to have cost \$7,000,000; Custom House, New York, \$1,850,000; Girard College, Philadelphia, \$2,000,000; Custom House, Portland, Maine, \$500,000. Here in this city the capital cost of the Asylum for the Insane was \$450,000, and I think it is not using too strong a term if I say that it is a shame that the Province of Ontario should have for its legislative buildings the present structures and its Asylum for the Insane costing nearly as much as is proposed to spend on new Parliament and depart-

mental buildings. The Central Prison cost \$586,000 and the University of Toronto \$250,000. I give these figures so that the House will see and the country will see that in proposing to spend on behalf of the Province \$750,000 for new Parliament Buildings we are acting with that due regard for economy which has always characterized the Government proposals, and that we are making a proposition that the people of the Province can well afford to sanction. There is only one other matter to mention, and that is in relation to the funds. The Government does

NOT PROPOSE TO BORROW ANY MONEY

for the erection of the buildings. During the current year—and the proposal is to proceed at once with the erection of the buildings if the House sanctions the motion—the amount proposed to be expended is \$150,000 or \$200,000, our intention being that the buildings shall be expected to be completed within three years from the time the contract is signed. Indeed, the contract will call for their completion within three years, and, while I am not going to say that this will be realized, if I am allowed to remain by the favour of the people and the grace of my leader in my present office, the people of this Province will see the buildings occupied within, at the outside, four years from the time the expenditure is authorized. We propose to meet the expenditure out of the money that will be in hand. I am assured by the Treasurer that he anticipates without any idea that he will be disappointed that a settlement will be arrived at as to the unsettled accounts between the Dominion, the Province of Quebec, and this Province, and that when this settlement is reached we shall be entitled to a sum no less than a million of money in cash. He concluded by moving that the Speaker do leave the chair.

Mr. MORRIS said it was not often he had to support the Government in a matter before the House, but he was pleased that the matter had now been brought before the House. He stood in reference to this matter just where he stood four years ago, and he only regretted that the Government had not gone on with the work so that the Parliament might now have been in possession of buildings suitable for the Province. He had no doubt when the tenders came in they would amount to less than those offered in 1880. He could not understand how any one could be opposed to the erection of new buildings, and he was satisfied also that the people of the Province would be in favour of the erection of new buildings. He was prepared to sustain most heartily and cordially the motion before the House, believing that he was not alone in his view even amongst the Opposition.

Mr. MEREDITH differed from Mr. Morris in his views on the question. He did not think that Mr. Fraser had made out a case—first as to the necessity for the buildings, next that the funds could be provided without injuring the finances, and thirdly as to the site. He proceeded to criticize the statement that \$125,000 to \$150,000 would be needed for the erection of a new wing for the Crown Lands Department, and he quoted the records of the House to show that only \$25,000 would be necessary for a vault. He contended that Mr. Fraser's figures with regard to the cost of the erection of State and city buildings only showed either that the buildings proposed to be erected were not fit for the Province, or that the buildings would cost more than the amount asked. He said that there was nothing to show

THAT THE MONEY NEEDED

would be forthcoming, and asserted that it was delusive to expect the anticipated settlement of the financial matters between this Province and the Dominion and Quebec. He opposed the selection of the site, and suggested that this and Government House block should be disposed of. Then there was a strong feeling that the public at large should not continue to support Upper Canada College, and while he recognized the great good that the institution had done in the past, yet he thought that the assets of that institution should be taken to support the University or some other educational work. He suggested, therefore, that the land occupied by Upper Canada College should be taken for the site. Again, it was a mistake not to place the Education Department in the new buildings. He proposed that the Education Department should be placed in the new buildings, and the Normal School put in the neighbourhood of the University. If this land were sold with the other land then there would be sufficient realized to erect suitable buildings on the present site of Upper Canada College.

Hon. T. B. PARDEE said that Mr. Meredith had advanced considerably in his views on the subject. He now said that if the buildings are to be erected they must be erected in Toronto, and that they must be adequate for the purpose, but he takes exception to the location. Now Mr. Meredith has not such strong objection to the erection of new buildings, he is not quite as firmly convinced that these buildings are adequate for the purposes they are used, but he thinks the distance to the proposed site is too great. What is the distance? Ten or fifteen minutes' walk from the railway station, and if the buildings are erected in the Park there must be some means of reaching them besides walking. The city of Toronto is growing, and he contended that the site chosen is the most convenient place to erect the buildings. As to the