

find that in Dorchester for 175 convicts, or 100 more than in the Manitoba penitentiary, the total cost for rations was \$5,684, or an average per capita of \$33.70. Assuming that reasonable economy is practiced in the Dorchester penitentiary; there cannot be anything else. and reckless extravagance in the Manitoba penitentiary; there cannot be anything else. The warden himself reports that when he took charge of that penitentiary he found very little discipline among either the officers or the convicts, and when one sees the totality of the expenditure one is not surprised that he should report in these terms. I think that penitentiary calls for a pretty severe examination at the hands of the inspector, and the hon. gentleman's duty demands that the inspector shall do something more than go through a perfunctory examination in the face of facts like these.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are exceptional circumstances in the case of the Manitoba penitentiary. I am perfectly satisfied that there is now no want of discipline, nor any extravagance there. The penitentiary at Dorchester is admirably managed; and it has many circumstances in its favour, in addition to the great vigilance and activity of its warden. But Manitoba has vastly improved in its management and economy, and is in a very satisfactory condition. I will not undertake to say that there may not be improvements or economies introduced there, and I will give careful attention to the question of fuel supply, so as to be able to account for last year's expenditure in that regard. Take the working expenses of the two penitentiaries by comparison:

	Dorchester.	Manitoba.
Heating.....	\$2,280	\$5,127
Lighting.....	450	739
Maintenance of buildings.....	1,500	3,165
Maintenance of machinery.....	500	1,247
Armory.....	50	178
Kitchen.....	200	539

And so on. We have been getting gradually on a better footing in Manitoba, but a good deal of equipment has been required. The want of discipline and harmony among the officers was a remnant of the old disease that existed there in consequence of the want of management in previous years. But I am satisfied that under the present warden there can be no want of discipline that he would not promptly report to the department and promptly correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The warden, Col. Irvine, evidently is a man who is not afraid to speak his mind. I have quoted the paragraph in which he speaks of the disgraceful want of discipline among either the officers or the convicts, and I presume that a man who is bold and manly enough to call attention to that will see that the remedy is applied. I do not want to make any reflection upon so efficient an inspector as

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. Moylan, but I fail to see why the condition of this penitentiary should have passed his inspection year after year. It may be that he can give an explanation of it; but I want further to call attention to the report of the warden. He says:

When I arrived I found the prison buildings in a very dirty and dilapidated condition, and on examining the quarters I found them still worse. It was evident that no cleaning and repairing had been done to them for at least two or three years. A thorough cleaning and overhauling had to be gone into.

Now, it does seem to me that in a public building on which we had been lavishing public expenditure with an unsparing hand for many years, and which we were under the impression had regularly been visited by the proper officer, whose duty it was to report to the Government and this House, we had certainly a right to conclude no such condition of affairs could possibly exist under his inspection as Col. Irvine reports he found when he took charge of the prison. I do not mean to charge that Mr. Moylan performs his duties otherwise than satisfactorily; I make no charge; but these facts would seem to imply that his inspection was a mere perfunctory inspection, and not a thorough one. But unless he has drawn these facts to the attention of the department—and I take it that he could not have done so, or the matter would have been remedied—their existence implies a want of proper inspection on his part.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must say for Mr. Moylan that I do not think he was required to visit the prison for two years before the appointment of Mr. Irvine. The prison was under the charge of the acting warden, who found the state of discipline worse even than Mr. Irvine reports it to have been; but being there temporarily, and not having complete powers of appointment and dismissal of officials, he was not in a position to make a reorganization of the staff. He has made a statement to me, in explanation of the strictures in the report of Colonel Irvine with regard to the cleanliness of the penitentiary, and he represents that in that respect the complaints are very much exaggerated and could only apply to certain quarters. We must do the justice to say that during the time of Mr. Foster's incumbency, not only was his authority necessarily somewhat limited by the fact of his being a temporary officer, but he was sent there with very special instructions as regards expenditure, putting the accounts on a better footing, and everything of that kind, and certainly he performed very satisfactorily a very onerous task.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman say that the Inspector of Penitentiaries was not able to visit this penitentiary for a couple of years?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He did not visit it during the incumbency of Mr. Foster.