

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does not the hon. gentleman think it was very unfortunate that we should have an inspector who would not inspect these penitentiaries the furthest away from the Capital, and therefore, the most in need of inspection? It may not be as necessary to inspect the Kingston penitentiary, because that is visited so frequently by magistrates and others that the public are likely to have some knowledge of any insubordination or insecurity, which they would not have in the case of a distant penitentiary like the Manitoba one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is annually inspected, except during an occasion of that kind. Mr. Foster was one of the principal officers sent out by my department, and during his incumbency it was thought better to allow him a free hand, so that when we made the selection of a permanent warden we should have some standard of comparison to go by as regards expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this Manitoba penitentiary, the attention of the Minister of Justice was called to it, as the House will very well remember, some four or five years ago. The reports of want of discipline and extravagant expenditure had reached us, and it certainly was not for want of bringing the matter to the special attention of the Minister of Justice that these irregularities, indicated in the report of his department, were allowed to grow to the magnitude they seem to have attained. The hon. gentleman must recollect that year after year the condition of that penitentiary and the extravagance and want of efficiency in its management were brought very strongly under his personal notice. Under those circumstances, a more vigilant inspection ought to have been had. It is quite clear, unless Lieutenant-Colonel Irvine is entirely in fault, that things were entirely neglected in that penitentiary for a period of three or four years at least. The Minister of Justice now tells us that the condition of things, under his officer, Mr. Foster, was an immense improvement on what had prevailed before. If that be so, what must the condition have been at the time we were endeavouring to call the special attention of the Minister to the subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These are very 'ad captandum' statements, which sound very well, but will not bear examination. The complaint to which my attention was called were always with regard to expenditure, and expenditure only, under the management of Colonel Bedson. The whole attention of that officer, regardless of every other interest, was in the direction of perfect cleanliness and discipline. Every officer and prisoner in the establishment was as completely under the control of his word and eye as a company of soldiers, but the expenditure was, I was bound to admit, very extravagant indeed. And after two or three attempts to curtail it and get some satis-

factory explanation, he was relieved of the management; and since the time the acting warden took charge, the complaint has been completely removed as regards extravagant expenditure—completely removed. As regards cleanliness, I cannot say how many pounds of soap ought to have been expended more than were expended. I know nothing further of the matter than the statement of Colonel Irvine, and on the other hand, I know from Mr. Foster that that statement is grossly exaggerated. As regards the want of discipline, it amounts to this: When the head, to whom they were accustomed to render most implicit obedience, was removed, the staff broke up into factions and did not respect each other's authority, or the authority of the acting warden. There was but one cure for that, and that was, as soon as possible, to appoint a permanent head, who would act regularly on the statutory powers he possesses of employing guards and dismissing them, and re-establish complete subordination. That could not be done, under the administration of the acting warden, simply for the reason that everything could not be done at once. It was impossible to set the prison accounts right, to establish and enforce regulations for the curtailment of the expenditure, and at the same time exercise special supervision over officers who had been accustomed to a very different master, and, no doubt, were looking forward to the termination of his rule as a thing to be speedily expected, and many of them possibly aspiring to promotion. The first thing was to get matters on a satisfactory basis as regards expenditure, and then to get a warden who would enforce discipline, and Colonel Irvine has proved himself very competent and fairly economical.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I regret personally that the hon. gentleman should so completely adopt the view that extravagance has been completely eliminated from the Manitoba penitentiary. I cannot concur in that view. The hon. gentleman says he declines to go into the question of the cost of soap. Nobody did that here, and I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to complain of the criticisms which have been passed upon this expenditure. On its very face, the expenditure indicates extravagance. We have been told, year after year, that the cost of living in British Columbia exceeds that in any other part of the Dominion, and it might be said that it is hardly fair to draw a comparison between the cost of the penitentiary in Manitoba and the cost of that in Dorchester or Kingston. But compare the cost with that of the penitentiary in British Columbia, where everything is said to be so high, I find that the per capita cost in the Manitoba penitentiary is \$120 beyond the per capita cost in British Columbia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does not that indicate extravagance?