

convicts. On that occasion a practical man, a supporter of the hon. gentleman, who is not now in the House, Mr. Currier, the present Postmaster of this city, expressed his hesitation on the vote in these words:

"I doubt if the construction of this grist mill will tend in that direction. I know something about mills, and I do not think it would be a good investment merely for the purpose of grinding the wheat for feeding the prisoners. As hon. gentlemen will see the difference between the price of wheat and the price of flour is very small, and it might require a large number of convicts to be employed on it—

"Mr. MACKENZIE. You might have to employ a miller.

"Mr. CURRIER. So that the construction of that mill will not tend to reduce the expenses *per capita* of the prisoners. Besides, \$10,000 would be a sum quite inadequate for the construction of a mill of that kind.

"Mr. BLAKE. The amount to be set apart for the mill is \$4,800 only.

"Mr. CURRIER. I do not see how they can build one for \$4,800."

Well, the vote passed and nothing was done, and there being no reappearance of the vote in the Estimates, I asked in 1891 if anything was to be done about it. The reply was:

"Mr. McDONALD (Picton). We did not proceed with it."

This announcement was made, and there was the end of it. Last year there was no statement that the grist mill was to be proceeded with either, and I suppose that there was no intention of going on with it, nor do I know under what vote it has been proceeded with. There is but a trifling allusion to it in the report of the warden, who says something about the grist mill being completed. I have no doubt the result will be increased extravagance, instead of economy. Now, I want to understand out of what vote, and under what circumstances, the grist mill was erected, how it is expected to pay, what is to be the cost of running, fuel, and so forth? What is the scheme for purchasing wheat on the market, and out of what vote the money was obtained for this experiment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the miller, of course he is appointed to run the mill. The report of the Inspector says:

"A grist mill, of sufficient capacity to grind flour for this, as well as for the Penitentiaries of St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester, has been fitted up in one end of the Insane Asylum building. It will go into operation as soon as the steam from the new boiler-house can be introduced to set the machinery in motion. The warden expects that a goodly amount will be saved yearly by manufacturing the supply of flour on the premises."

I believe the Warden has very good judgment on these matters, and he has been very persistent in expressing his belief that a considerable saving would be effected in this way. This was done for the purpose of utilizing a portion of the building which was not wanted for other purposes. There was a stone building built, and all they had to do was to put in the machinery.

Mr. BLAKE. They had just put up the building.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was built as an Insane Asylum, but the whole building was not wanted for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that it is an admirable place for a mill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the addition of \$400 to the warden's salary, I do not think the hon. Minister of Justice would have given that if it were illegal, as the hon. gentleman suggests. I fancy that he satisfied himself that he had a right to recommend the addition of this small sum. It is quite true that the warden has a house, but it is also true that this is the largest penitentiary we have, containing the greatest number of prisoners, and is, I think, managed in the most economical manner; and, I think, as a sort of reward for his being the oldest officer of the kind, and his great efficiency, it is no more than right that he should receive this encouragement for his long, faithful and able management of that institution. The hon. gentleman objects to some small

Mr. BLAKE.

sums which have been added to the salaries of the officers. The warden's clerk gets an advance of \$100 because he is an efficient officer, and has been there for some time. Some of the keepers and other officers receive an addition of \$50 each to their salaries, I suppose, as being in the light of a statutory increase, although they are not, strictly speaking, civil servants, but they are substantially and practically civil servants, and they have got this \$50 increase as it is given to other civil servants. I presume these are the reasons for making these small additions. The \$500 for the miller speaks for itself. The hon. gentleman says the responsibility has diminished. Well, it has diminished this year, I fancy, in consequence of the superabundance of convicts who overflowed from some of the other penitentiaries—from Montreal and from Dorchester—and when transferred temporarily to Kingston. There were 217 released on the expiration of their sentence last year, and in consequence of the prosperity of the country there has been less crime than usual. I will try to get some further information to satisfy the enquiring mind of my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has had grace enough to confess that he has not explained the item. He talks about little increases. These little increases amount to \$4,360 in one year in one institution, or about 11 per cent. He has also laid down the proposition that to persons not in the inside department of the service he is going to apply the \$50 statutory increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, he said that they ought to be put on a fair footing with the others. How high are you going to put a guard? These men have had their salaries fixed for several years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman alluded to the \$50 increase, and if we are to understand that this rule is to be extended, we had better have it regulated in some way. I contend that there is nothing in the condition of the institution or the country to justify these increases. The maximum salary of any warden, under the law, is \$2,600. The hon. gentleman gave no explanation as to the vote out of which the mill was built. It is very important that we should know, after the vote had been taken, and the hon. Minister had declared that it had not been expended, how it is that the mill has been built after all.

28. St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... \$83,546.36

Mr. BLAKE. Here, again, we are face to face with a number of increases. The salaries have been increased at the rate, not of 11 per cent. in this case, but of 6 and 7 per cent., an average of \$2,770 upon the existing salaries, comparing the salaries in force last year with those of the same officials this year, or an increase of \$2,770 on a total of \$36,840. The staff is a large one and always has been, compared with other penitentiaries and compared with the number of convicts. The maintenance has also increased very largely. I pointed out last year that while the maintenance of the penitentiary at Kingston was, on an average of \$70.29 per convict, that of St. Vincent de Paul was \$33.33, or \$13 a head more than at Kingston. But while the cost at Kingston has been increased to \$74.70 per head, that at St. Vincent de Paul has been increased to \$93.80, or \$10 over last year—that is, \$23 over the cost of Kingston last year, or \$18.50 over that of Kingston this year, about 25 per cent. more. It is alleged, therefore, that to maintain a convict at St. Vincent de Paul—not counting the cost of the officials—but simply the cost of maintenance, rations, clothes, fuel, light, and medical attendance, &c., cost one-fourth more than at Kingston, and an aggregate of \$93.80 per head as compared with \$33.33 last year. Some explana-