

in Canada. I am giving these figures for the information of the hon. member for Kingston City and for general information.

My hon. friend's next criticism or complaint was in respect to dismissals of officials from the staff of Kingston penitentiary. I admit there have been dismissals in the last few years from the staff of that institution and I am sorry to say that in a great number of cases those officials have been residents of Kingston, and many of those dismissals or retirements have not met with the approval of the hon. member for Kingston City. I can only assure him that any such action taken to change the staff of that institution has been taken without regard to friendship or politics or anything else, but solely with the object of improving the penitentiary staff. I am inclined to think, from what I know of the matter, that these changes were necessary and improvement has resulted. There has been only one dismissal of a senior officer: a shoemaker instructor who was not considered fit for the work allotted to him and who had not control of the men placed in his charge. There were seventeen officers of various standing retired to promote efficiency. That means that there may have been no positive wrong doing on their part; there may have been no culpable act. They may not have been found asleep on duty or trafficking with prisoners and the like, but they were not suited to the job. It is not a position that appeals to a great many people; it is a very difficult position. Seventeen were retired from the staff of that institution to promote efficiency. Two were retired on account of age, having reached the age of sixty-five. One was retired and marked unsuitable after one month's trial. That makes a total to May 31, 1933, of twenty-one.

During the year 1933-34 the following retirements took place in Kingston penitentiary:

Dismissals of guards for trafficking with prisoners.. . . .	2
Asleep on duty.. . . .	1
Neglect of duty.. . . .	1
Guard convicted of indictable offence.	1
	— 5
Retired during the same period to promote efficiency.. . . .	2
Retired on account of age.. . . .	1
Retired as unsuitable after trial.. . .	5
Retired on account of reduction of staff.. . . .	5
	—13
	18

This makes a total for those two years of thirty-nine.

Of those dismissals two have been reemployed, making a net change of thirty-seven.

In all these cases the retirements or dismissals have taken place after a very careful investigation. The investigation has been conducted by the warden and by the superintendent and the evidence has been submitted to me for my approval. I have not approved in every case, but I have in the great majority of cases on the evidence submitted. I have sought in every way to improve the penitentiary staff when changes have been caused by these retirements. If my hon. friend from Kingston City desires the fullest information it is available for him in my department at any time. I am not going to place before the house the names of these officers who have been retired or go into details in regard to any particular case unless requested so to do, but I wish to inform the hon. member for Kingston City that all the particulars and all the details are at his disposal if he desires to make himself familiar with them. I am aware that when a retirement or dismissal takes place the great majority of those concerned immediately go to the hon. member for Kingston City; he is a good-hearted man, he sympathizes with them, and he immediately communicates with Ottawa. The men likewise complain to me and lay their cases very fully before me. Then it becomes my duty to go over the cases and reconsider them. I have done the best I could; I have formed the best judgment I could, and I am prepared to stand by the conclusions to which I have come in each case.

Passing from that, the hon. member for Southeast Grey in her criticism of penitentiary matters on Saturday night dwelt to some extent on the case known as the Murray Kirkland case and on the evidence which was submitted when that case was tried before the criminal courts of Canada. It will be remembered by those in the house who have paid attention to such matters that when the riot took place in Kingston penitentiary on October 17, 1932, at a very critical and difficult time, the acting warden made an agreement with the rioters that if they were to desist and stop the riot he would refrain from punishing them under prison rules and would allow their cases to be heard before the criminal courts of the country. I do not know that the warden acted wisely when he made that arrangement, but he did make it, and on that arrangement being made and announced the rioters desisted for the time being. It was felt that that arrangement should be carried out, and subsequently in the spring of 1933, some twenty-nine or thirty of the rioters were tried at the county judge's criminal court at Kingston, and among others who were tried on that occasion was Murray