

—and while the clergymen who were being paid to administer to the fifty Methodists would be occupied for nine months, the poor Presbyterians would only have thirty days of a clergyman, if they were employed in proportion. I think it would be much better to strike out that provision and allow the minister to appoint the clergyman as in the past.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—In addition to the objections already urged, which were in the mind of the government, no doubt, when they framed the Bill, there is a further objection—and it is a strong one—that in this matter political patronage comes in and our knowledge of politics, as they are current at the present moment, is that they come into everything, and the political views of the different clergymen in the town where the penitentiary is located would be thoroughly gauged by those who had the control of the patronage, and the chaplain would be forced on the minister. The appointment would be made upon political grounds. Apart from all the other reasons urged, that would be a very bad state of things, and it is the state of things, from our knowledge of politics in Canada at the present time, which would be sure to exist. I rather like the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman from Halifax, and he should move it in order that it might go on record, but it might not be pressed to a division until further consideration was given to it, and it could then be found whether it might not be modified or some other changes brought into it that would make it fair and harmonious. I can scarcely agree with my hon. friend from Kingston when he is disposed to act as an umpire and settle this matter between the different denominations of Protestants by telling them they could bow to the Church of England because it has better claims. All the churches in this country are on an equal footing and the Church of England has no better status than any other denomination. I think the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman from Halifax would have a good effect. There is no question about the Catholics. Whatever proportion of criminals are Catholics, they would receive consolation from the Catholic clergy, and those who belonged to the Protestant denominations, or were

Hon. Mr. WATSON.

adherents of any Protestant denomination, would receive consolation from their own clergymen under that clause.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I understand that is the system that is in force now, and I find on looking over the notes, that it was supported by the minister who comes from New Brunswick who certainly ought to know. The Hon. Mr. Emmerson thought that that was a better way, and by striking out two lines I changed the reading of it and I would suggest to make it read as follows :

The minister, instead of appointing a Protestant chaplain for any penitentiary, may direct that the clergymen of the different Protestant denominations represented in the community where a penitentiary is situated, shall be permitted to perform the duties of the Protestant chaplaincy in rotation, each in his turn taking three months, the assignment being under the direction of the warden, in which case the salary allowed for a Protestant chaplain shall be in proportion to the time given to such duties by each.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—This clause is subversive of what we call the principle of conscience, I quote the first two lines, which read :

The minister, instead of appointing a Protestant chaplain for any penitentiary, may direct that the clergymen of the different Protestant denominations in the community, &c.

The different Protestant clergy may be vastly different from the prisoners—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No. In our penitentiaries there may be lots of Church of England people who will not accept the services of these clergymen.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—They can have their own.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—It is suggested that they shall have their own ministers. It should be put in the clause that the men in the penitentiaries have the right to call in any minister they please.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—It would never work. Every convict would have a chaplain of his own.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Why should the state have a right to dictate to the prisoner what clergyman he should have ?

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—He need not take them.