

I gave the other day is the result of the experience of past years. We found that the Act of last year was too expensive, and that it would be possible to reduce the expense considerably. We now propose to make one of the commissioners secretary to the board, and he is to receive \$1,000 a year for his salary. The two other commissioners are to be paid at the rate of \$5 a day for sixty days in the year. The commissioner who is secretary will be employed a much longer time than the others, and must consequently receive a higher salary. Under this arrangement the salaries will only amount to \$1,600 per year. In the new Bill we ask for power not to be obliged to have examinations at all the places in the Dominion. We may have examinations only at headquarters by giving ordinary notice, and those that want to compete may do so. Examination only takes place at headquarters when promotions are to be made.

Mr. BLAKE. There are three classes of expenditure, the secretary, the commissioners and the local examiners. After the experience of last year, I was anxious to know what proportion of this expenditure—which is not very large, I quite agree—would be devoted to the services of the local examiners, and what to those of the commissioners, and whether he intended this system to be one which should involve the necessity of the attendance of one of the commissioners where there was an examination abroad, or whether that was to be conducted solely by local examiners.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The experience of last year was tentative; moreover, we wished to put the system at once into operation. We sent one of the commissioners to Halifax, one to Toronto, and a third to Montreal. It was to organize the system, and after the experience of one year we think that the commissioners can be sent from headquarters. The secretary may remain here and be at the same time examiner for the city of Ottawa. He has no travelling expenses, and he is paid yearly as an examiner, but he is paid according to the rate fixed by Parliament, at \$1,000 a year. Then, at eight or ten other places where there were local examiners no travelling expenses would have to be paid, and we would pay to those examiners according to the present law \$5 a day for each day of service, the whole time not to exceed sixty days. The experience of last year shows that three or four days will suffice for each commissioner to do the work. If there are ten of them it would amount to \$200 for the local examiners. The hon. gentleman knows that these local examiners have only to see that the examination shall be *bona fide*, that there is no collusion, and that the papers are sent to headquarters without being interfered with. They are sent up here and then the board of examiners meet, and those three commissioners here examine the papers and make their report, and decide which candidates have succeeded in the examination.

25. Administration of Justice.....\$36,700.00

Mr. BLAKE. I observe considerable reduction for the travelling expenses of the stipendiary magistrates. Would the hon. gentleman explain that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will only be two magistrates instead of three. Then the expenses of travelling consequent on railway communication, and the means of communication of every kind, have considerably lessened the expense.

26. Dominion Police.....\$15,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Dominion Police, I believe, is about the same strength as last year, perhaps a few men more. The present Minister of Justice thought it well to improve the corps and organization of the body generally, and to secure that improvement he has had to pay higher salaries.

27. Kingston Penitentiary.....\$112,878.23

In answer to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The details as to the different penitentiaries are given in the tables attached to the item, and, as the hon. gentleman will see, there is a decrease of over \$8,000 in the Kingston Penitentiary, and there is also a decrease in St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the Estimates are supported by such an abundant absence of statement on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The statements are in the Estimates themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. True, but the reasons for the increases are not here or anywhere so far as is apparent to the Committee. It is true that the total vote of Kingston does compare favorably with the vote for last year, but when you consider that Kingston is estimated for no less than 100 convicts less than last year, you perceive why the total vote should not be enhanced but should rather be diminished. Taking the same officers this year who were employed last year and there is an increase on the staff of about eleven per cent. on salaries. You find that there is an increase—contrary to law as the law now stands—in the warden's salary of \$400. I can see no reason for that increase at all. The warden of the penitentiary has supplied for him, at the public expense, a very handsome residence; in fact it was so handsome that after it was built we voted him a considerable sum of money to furnish it, because, as was said, it was impossible to expect a warden with a salary of \$2,600 a year to furnish such a house as that. Then there are also other perquisites in connection with his office, and I can see no reason why contemporaneously with diminished responsibility, with a number of convicts smaller than about one-seventh, or one-fourth less than it once had, with an institution which the hon. Minister described last year as having got to a state of perfection, and consequently running easier—I cannot see why this time should be chosen to increase the salary of the warden. Then we find that the warden's clerk's salary is increased, so is the salary of the steward, the matron, the deputy matron, the hospital overseer, the clerk of works and chief instructor, the stone cutter, the mason, the carpenter, the miller, the quarryman, the foundry man, the baker, the keepers, forty guards, the messenger and the teamsters, or in all an increase of \$4,360 on the salaries of last year. Then with reference to maintenance, I pointed out last year that the maintenance proposed for last year was considerably in excess of the maintenance which had been proposed for the year before *per capita*. Of course, there are many of the expenditures which partake of the nature of fixed charges and which do not vary very much by any increase or diminution to a moderate extent in the number of convicts. But the maintenance of the institution, leaving out these charges, is a reasonable test of economy, or the reverse. I pointed out last year that the expenditure then estimated for maintenance was higher in Kingston than the year before; it was \$70.22 per head, while this year it is \$74.70, an increase of \$4.50 over last year. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. Minister of Justice ought to have supplied his representative in this House with such information as would have enabled him to give explanations upon the subject. With reference to the grist mill it will be remembered that three or four years ago a vote was proposed for the erection of a grist mill in Kingston in connection with Kingston Penitentiary. It was opposed by a good many of us at that time. We thought it was a mistaken vote, that it would not conduce to economy, that in an institution of that kind a steam grist mill should not be erected for the purpose of grinding wheat into flour for the