Government \$12,000. The Government took over the machinery, and this sum of \$12,000 was incidentally smothered up by taking this machinery over that amount beyond its inventoried value. Since 1903 down to the 1st of July, 1905, the Government operated the north shop themselves, with the result (as shown in the answer given the other day to the question of the honorable member for Centre Bruce) that Central Prison labor has earned on the account, as there shown, three-fifths of one cent per man per ten-hour day during that period. The figures I repeat:

- 1. What amounts of money were paid by the Government during twelve years ending July 31st, 1905, on account of woodworking shop at Central Prison for
 - (a) Materials and small repairs;

(b) Salaries of officials on duty in that shop;

- (c) General expenses of the industries at Central Prison apportioned to that shop;
- (d) On buildings and machinery?

Answer.—(a) \$388,412.65

- (b) 61,312.55
- (c) 17,656.09 (d) 19,243.27

Total\$486,624.56

2. What was the amount of the increase or decrease (state which) in the value of the stock on hand from the beginning to the end of this period?

Answer.—Decrease \$6,523.89.

3. What were the gross sales of that shop during the same period?

Answer.—\$495,003.95.

4. What was the average net return per annum for the prison labor of this shop during this period?

Answer.—Average net gain was \$154.63 per annum.

5. How much did this mean per man per day for the prison labor employed?

Answer.—About three-fifths of one cent per man per ten-hour

6. About what percentage of the output of the woodworking shop was marketed in the Province of Ontario during the twelve years ending July 31st, 1905?

Answer.-Over ninety per cent.

7. About what percentage of the output of this shop is marketed in Ontario under the present contract?

Answer.—About twenty-six per cent.

OUT OF POCKET.

Taking the whole period of prison labor, from its inception down to the 1st of July, 1905, I have not the slightest doubt that upon a full investigation it would appear that with the items of cost of operations charged against the goods as they would be charged by a manufacturer today, it will clearly appear that not only has this Province not received one