

remember—it certainly was so in my own time—a very large proportion were heathen Chinese; their spiritual welfare is to be attended to on a more extended scale, at any rate as far as remuneration is concerned, though hitherto that was not found so necessary. In my time we simply availed ourselves of the services of ministers of religion in that neighborhood, giving them a certain engagement to attend to those who were not Chinese. We could conduct this rather economically; but the hon. gentleman proposes that two chaplains shall receive \$500 each. I would like to know what has rendered this charge necessary. Then there are increases in the salaries of the warden, deputy-warden and chief keeper, each of \$200. The surgeon has an increase of \$100, though I do not see why this should be; and there are two more guards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two chaplains provided for in the Penitentiary Bill—I presume; one Protestant, and one Roman Catholic.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there is any Chinese chaplain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was about to say, I do not know of any Chinese clergyman, or Bonze there; but the salary is the same as in Manitoba, \$500. The fact of the matter is, that we must have in all penitentiaries Catholic and Protestant chaplains.

Mr. BLAKE. We have had them before in the penitentiaries for years. I am not objecting to that; but to the increases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no increase. In British Columbia, the salaries are put on the same basis as in Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. Do you know why? Because there is an increase in Manitoba too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The two chaplains evidently heretofore received \$300 each, and now they get \$500, being put on a par with the chaplains in the other penitentiaries.

Mr. BLAKE. What other?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend brings down two estimates the same evening, and proposes to increase the chaplains' salaries in Manitoba to \$500 each or to \$1,000, and then says, it is reasonable to increase them in British Columbia, because they ought to be on a par with those of Manitoba.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; at the Dorchester Penitentiary the two chaplains get \$550 each, and I am quite surprised that the chaplains in British Columbia have not asked for a corresponding increase. They have to work as hard to save souls as the chaplains in the other penitentiaries—especially as it is part of their duty to try and convert the heathen Chinese. They ought to get a special allowance for that.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a very great difference in their situation. The number of Chinese was very large in proportion in my time. I fancy they were in a considerable majority. I would not be surprised to find that there were not more than twenty or twenty-five of other faiths in the penitentiary, and it is ridiculous to speak of the services of ministers of religion having charge of ten or twelve convicts, compared with chaplains having charge of sixty or seventy convicts. The services rendered are entirely different.

Mr. HOMER. One-third of the whole number are Chinese. I would like to know why the warden of the British Columbia Penitentiary gets only \$1,400, while the Manitoba warden receives \$2,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is another instance of better terms for British Columbia. I will inform the

Minister of Justice of the complaint made, that injustice is done to British Columbia; and I have no doubt, that if he has not the fear of the hon. member from West Durham before his eyes, he will perhaps increase the salary; but after the scathing criticisms passed on the Minister of Justice by the hon. gentleman opposite, I do not know that he will venture to do justice to British Columbia.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The officers in the other penitentiaries are paid higher salaries than is the case in British Columbia; I think myself the living is quite as high in British Columbia as it is in any other part of the Dominion. I think the officers are entitled to be paid at the same rate, and I sincerely trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down there will be an amount placed in them for that purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I rather think that the officers get their rations in the penitentiary.

22. Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate. \$56,733.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why this increase in the expenditure for the Senate? I notice there is a large increase for salaries. The Assistant Clerk of the French Journals, and the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, has an increase of \$100; the Assistant Clerk of Private Bills, and Clerk, \$100; Postmaster, \$200; the Housekeeper, \$200; the Speaker's Messenger, \$100; there is an additional permanent Messenger, \$500, and an increase of \$100 to the House carpenter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that either the Finance Minister or any of us here can control these matters, as they are settled by the Senate Committee on Contingencies. The requirements of that House are communicated to the Minister of Finance, and all he has to do is to put them in the Estimates. He cannot control them or cut them down, and whatever we may think of them here, or any person may think, I do not suppose my hon. friend would want to get up a war between the two Houses by intermeddling with their quiet little additions of \$100 here or \$100 there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand that they pay a higher rate than we do in this end to officers who perform the same functions. Does not the hon. gentleman think that the Government should interfere in such cases? Even their messengers are paid 50 cts. a day more than ours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has always been the case, and I am sorry that it has been so. The spirit is somewhat the same as that exhibited by an hon. member from any one of the Provinces when he insists that the salaries paid to the officers in that Province shall be the same as those paid to similar officers in the other Provinces. They regard it as a matter of Provincial dignity. I am bound to say that I think the officers of the Senate are fully paid, and more than fully paid, comparing their salaries with our officers, and their work with the duties which our officers perform. But we cannot well help it; I myself think, and I have suggested, that there should be a Joint Committee of both Houses to regulate these matters, and that as much as possible they should be officers of Parliament and not officers of one House or the other. I think considerable economy might be practiced in that way. I suppose the Senate, as an independent branch of the Legislature, prefers to retain the control and management of their own expenses, and I do not see very well how we can interfere, except by an expression of opinions, by the leading hon. members of the House—which, of course, they will read and ponder over—pointing out that while the work is much easier, the salaries are as large or, in some cases, larger. As my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) has pointed out, even the messengers are paid more, and they certainly have not near as much or as hard work to do as