Mr. CASEY. I had been told that another gentleman had been appointed to the same position in Winnipeg as that which Mr. Lecours held.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there is a clerk of works, Mr. Dan. Smith. He is not an architect.

Mr. CASEY. Not the same salary or position?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that I cannot but think that this vote of \$6,500, added to the other votes which have been taken for the Manitoba Penitentiary, shows that it is not an economically managed institution, and I think it deserves the serious consideration of the Minister of Justice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe Mr. Bedson, who is the warden, enjoys the confidence of the Minister of Justice. I think Mr. Moylan, who is the inspector, also speaks very well of him. Of course, I have not watched the expenses; but I have no doubt the Minister of Justice will observe my hon. friend's statement in the Hansard, and will give it every consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope he will observe it in some other way. I hope the hon. Minister who represents him in this House will bring it to his attention. I do not trust to the Hansard as the medium of communication between myself and the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very convenient.

Mr. CASEY. The man who has succeeded Mr. Lecours—his office is not called by the same name. How do the salaries compare?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is paid \$3 a day, whilst the other was an architect, and was paid \$2,400 a year.

LEGISLATION.

House of Commons.

	To cover expenditure for additional stationery	\$5,000 00
	tion during recess	1,000 00
	To cover amount necessary to complete the publication of the Debates of the Session of 1884, under increasing expenditure	
	authorized by House last Session	16,000 00
	shorthand reporters, &c., in connection with Select Committees	1,000 00
225	To meet additional expenditure in connection with the Sessional Messengers Printing, printing paper and binding	2 000 07 20,000 00
	To cover extra claims of certain Returning Officers at the last General Elections	2,000 00
	To F. S. Bastien, to re-imburse him for can- didate's nomination deposit returned to	
	To pay Hon. Mr. Vail, \$232, and Mr.	200 00
	Robertson, \$256, balance due them on account of Sessional Indemnity, 1882-83, and to Mr. Colby the amount which will	
	otherwise be deducted from his allow- ance, on account of his absence during	
	the present Session, \$192	640 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the circumstances connected with this return of \$200.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the case of a candidate who paid the \$200. The sheriff paid that over to the credit of the Receiver-General, instead of holding the money, and, when the election was over and the man, having received ever a third of the votes, was entitled to his money, it was not to be had, the sheriff having made a mistake and paid it over to the Receiver-General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Lent and returned, in fact?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is to return it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is quite sure that this is the case with reference to Bastien?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; with reference to that item.

Mr. BLAKE. That it was money which the candidate was entitled to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Which the returning officer should have returned to him, because he had more than a third of the votes.

Mr. BLAKE. What election was it, pray?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I forget.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon, gentleman will find that the person did not get a third of the votes, did not go to the poll, and was not entitled to the return of the deposit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On enquiry, I find that is not the statement of fact. In order to get it exactly, we will have this struck out, and have it put in the sub Supplementary Estimates, if it is all right. In regard to the item in reference to the Sessional indemnity, Mr. Vail was taken ill while coming here. I believe he had some difficulty in getting across, and did not get here until some time during the Session. It was thought right, following other precedents, that he should have the whole of his indomnity. Mr. Robertson's case was the same. He started for Ottawa, but could not come to the House on account of a severe bronchial attack. Mr. Colby and Mr. Nelson, the Senator whose name is mentioned in the next vote, were both tossing on the sea in their vain attempt to get here in time. They were on board the Celtic, which was tossing about for six weeks, and I think that is suffering enough and this is a small enough compensation for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the return of my hon. friend, the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) to this House, coincided exactly with the return to this House of another hon. member who was kept tossing about most improperly and unfairly on the billows of an election petition, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I think, in all conscience under the circumstances, if this kind of thing is to be done, my hon. friend from Bothwell, who was most improperly excluded from the House last Session, ought to have the whole Sessional indemnity this Session. I do not propose to oppose the other two, but in all conscience and justice I think the name of the hon. member for Bothwell should be added.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was not suggested to us, but now that it has been suggested, we will take it into consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I do not make any claim, because I do not think there is any claim. I think those members who are here for the full time should receive their Sessional indemnity, and those who are here for a portion of the time should receive an indemnity for the portion of the time they are here.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I think the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is entitled to the same consideration as the member for Bothwell.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon, member for Lunenburg is here under a new election. The hon, member for Bothwell is declared to be elected under the election of 1882.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that is a distinction without a difference. The hon. member for Lunenburg was unfairly kept out of the House last Session.

Mr. BLAKE. The election was void in that case. In the other, it was a due election of the hon. gentleman who is now sitting for the county of Bothwell, but he was not only kept out of his seat improperly, but an intruder was imposed