

Austin retired some time ago; and I have been looking into the Public Accounts, and I find that there is a clerk engaged in the discharge of his duties, who holds the rank of third class clerk, which he held when appointed in 1876 or 1877.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think Mr. Austin has retired within the past year.

Mr. MILLS. I think he was frequently absent before he was put on the retired list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who is the officer.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Keyes.

DOMINION POLICE.

223. Further amount required to meet the expenditure of the year..... \$4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose is this wanted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been temporarily an increase of the force, from twenty-five to thirty-four. The memorandum I have on this subject says that the military guard has been withdrawn from Rideau Hall, which cost \$3,000 annually, and the duties are altogether done by the police. Then, four watchmen, formerly employed by the Public Works Department, have been superseded by two policemen, who perform the duty more efficiently. A mail service is also performed by the police, between the various Government offices every half-hour, during office hours. This system operates exceedingly well. Instead of a messenger being sent with a single letter across the square, sometimes having to wait for an answer, the policemen who are here go every half-hour to a box, into which every Department drops a letter intended for any other Department, and the messengers are kept for more important matters.

Mr. CASEY. If this practice saves any pay for messengers, it is certainly an economy, but I fancy that putting on extra policemen to do the work for which messengers are appointed and paid is not economizing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is merely a part of the work they did before the increase; but the increase is necessary.

PENITENTIARIES.

224 { To meet sundry payments in connection with the British Columbia Penitentiary, to 30th June, 1883..... \$1,948 44
Amount required to meet expenditure of Manitoba Penitentiary..... 6,500 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to recoup the appropriation for the current year, for the following reasons, viz.: In the latter part of July, 1882, \$2,128 was paid to the Kingston Penitentiary for clothing furnished to this institution in May of that year. This amount should have been paid in 1881-82; but as the account for that year was closed, it was paid out of the appropriation for 1882-83, in consequence of which there was not enough left to pay the June accounts of that year, amounting to \$1,948.44, and they had to be paid out of the appropriation for 1883-84.

Mr. CASEY. What is this vote for Manitoba Penitentiary for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Four hundred and fifty dollars of this amount is to pay extra guards who have been employed at different times during the year, in consequence of the illness of several members of the regular staff; \$475 is for an allowance to Mr. Little, the late steward, who was compelled to retire on account of ill health; \$1,807 is for maintenance on account of the large increase to the prison population, the amounts asked for under the sub-heads of rations and clothing having been found insufficient to meet the requirements to the 30th of June, 1884. For heating, there is \$2,000, the amount voted for 1883-84 having been insufficient, in consequence of the severity of the winter. For the farm, there is \$1,768, the amount, \$400, voted for 1883-84 having been insufficient.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CASEY. In connection with the Manitoba Penitentiary, some facts have come to my knowledge which I think the attention of the Government should be called to. It appears that Major Bowles, an American, was a contractor for material to build the proposed fence around the penitentiary, and that Mr. Lecours was the architect instructed to look after the work. Mr. Lecours, it is said, certified to an account for \$4,000 for fence material, for which Major Bowles was paid, and it was suspected afterwards that the material had not been furnished. An officer was sent from here to investigate the matter, and he found this suspicion to be correct. Mr. Lecours was consequently recalled and given desultory work in the service here at half salary or something of that kind. If it be correct that he certified to the account when there was no material furnished, his punishment should have been more severe. If he did not do so, then the hon. Minister should explain why he was recalled and remove this suspicion in reference to his conduct. I have also been informed that at a subsequent date Major Bowles furnished the material and received a second payment of \$4,000, so that he came out of the affair with a clear profit of \$4,000. He is, however, reported to have said to his friends at Winnipeg that but a very small share of that came into his pocket, and he was grumbling on this account. I understand also that the fence has not been put up of wood, but is being erected of stone.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not give me notice privately that he was going to bring this matter up. I could not expect this to come up under this or any other item in these Estimates. The hon. gentleman is right in calling the attention of the House to this matter, but it is unfortunate he did not give me notice, because I am not in a position to give the explanations I would desire to give in answer to his remarks. I think the statement about the lumber is very much exaggerated. I think there was some lost, or some mistake made, but I do not think there was anything like a loss of \$4,000. Mr. Lecours had been there as architect, but we found that the presence of an architect there was not necessary, in view of the expense, and therefore, without censuring Mr. Lecours, I thought it better that the position of architect should be abolished. I consequently recalled Mr. Lecours and gave him a position in the Department, continued him in the Department at a reduced salary which was very proper, because the salary he was receiving up there was in conformity with the larger expenses required by an officer there over those required at Ottawa. The fence the hon. gentleman speaks of has not been erected; my attention has been specially called to it by the Department of Justice, and I may say by one of the hon. members from there, especially the hon. member for Lisgar. I think the hon. gentleman will see that we will have some vote in the Estimates that are to come down which will enable us most likely, not to erect now a stone wall, but probably put up temporarily a wooden fence. I understand there is no fence at all there, but the bulk of the sum to be voted will have to be devoted to the increased accommodation of the penitentiary, which is very crowded and requires a number of new cells. We try to accommodate the convicts there, but I cannot give the hope that we will erect a stone wall.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry I had not an opportunity of asking the hon. member privately about this matter as he would then be able to tell us more about it. Perhaps he may be able to say something more about it on Concurrence. I understood, however, that another officer had been appointed in Mr. Lecours' position, to the same office that Mr. Lecours had held. That was incorrect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the vote for the Manitoba Penitentiary comes up, I hope I will be in a position to give the information.