

Quebec. Can the minister give us any information at this time on conditions in the penitentiaries? Is the population increasing? Is the accommodation sufficient? Will there be considerably more accommodation as the result of this new reformatory being erected?

**Mr. Harris:** I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to repeat what I have said so often before. This is not the occasion for a discussion of general policies and difficulties that face a minister in charge of any particular department. The purpose of this vote, of course, is to provide extra money which had already been approved in principle last summer and has been found to be deficient in amount. This relates exclusively to the expenditures necessary as a result of the riot in Kingston last summer, and is for the purpose of rebuilding the property.

My hon. friend made some mention of the vote itself. It should be borne in mind that the vote which is referred to here is the same vote which appeared in the main estimates last year. In that vote there was a reference to an item with respect to the penitentiary of St. Paul in Quebec.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I have one further question. The item on page 5 of the supplementary estimates reads:

Construction, improvements and new equipment, including provision for the establishment and construction of a new institution in the province of Quebec for the confinement and reformation of federal prisoners—further amount required, \$200,000.

On page 19 of the details we find the following: "Penitentiaries: Kingston, \$200,000." There is also another total of \$200,000. Can the minister elucidate a little on that?

**Mr. Harris:** I am discussing the buildings item at the moment. Is there another item that my hon. friend wishes to take up now?

**Mr. Nesbitt:** There are two items.

**Mr. Green:** The details appear on page 19.

**Mr. Knowles:** I believe it is the same item set up in a different way.

**Mr. Harris:** We are talking about Kingston, which is the item I referred to, namely repairs to the penitentiary at Kingston caused by the riot last summer.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Perhaps the minister has misunderstood me. Will he refer to page 5?

**Mr. Harris:** Of the bill?

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Of the supplementary estimates, which sets out the items. There he will find reference to construction, improvements and new equipment, including the construction of a new institution in the province of Quebec. The amount is \$200,000. On page 19, in addition to that, there is another

### Supply—Labour

\$200,000 item set out for Kingston. Perhaps the minister can deal with that.

**Mr. Harris:** I am sorry. I have been following the bill which I have before me and not the printed supplementaries that hon. members have. Let us confine ourselves to Kingston for the moment and dispose of that. There was a riot there last summer and repairs are necessary as a result. That causes us to ask for a further vote of \$170,000 directly, and a possible expenditure of another \$30,000; therefore we have made the item \$200,000.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** No.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** It says "Quebec" here.

**Mr. Harris:** I am coming to that. I am asking hon. members to bear with me. If we pass this item, then we can go on with the other. Is that agreeable?

**Mrs. Fairclough:** No.

**Mr. Harris:** All right. What is the other item you are talking about?

**Mr. Montgomery:** There is another item on page 5.

**Mr. Harris:** It is in the loans, and when we come to the loans we shall deal with that.

**Mr. Pallett:** The item on page 5 refers to the province of Quebec and the particulars refer to Kingston.

**Mr. Harris:** I made it clear, I hope, that the wording in this supplementary is the same wording as in the original estimate for the past year. It happened that in that estimate there was a reference to a building in the province of Quebec. The item also refers to all forms of construction.

Item agreed to.

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

General administration—

587. Annuities Act — administration — further amount required, \$26,000.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** I would like to have an explanation of this amount. I note that this refers to commissions paid to agents. Commissions are paid to agents in some instances and in others to postmasters, as the case may be. This amount of \$26,000 is approximately 10 per cent of the total commissions which are estimated to be required for the year. There is no increase in the amount in the main estimates for next year; therefore it would look as though it is not an increase in that case. Something else has come up in the meantime. Will the minister say what it is? Has a special contract been written, or was the business in excess of what had been expected? Just what is the answer?