## After the recess,

Mr. Beaty said that before giving a vote on this subject he desired more information. He did not see why the people of the West should be called on to pay for these river police, and he warned the Government that by their present course they were only furnishing another weapon to the disaffected anti-Union party. But having decided on it, he knew the Government would carry it. Now, his constituents sent him there to support the Government; but he had told them distinctly that he would not be passive in the hands of any party. He was a party man (hear, hear), and would only support the Government when he found them dealing equally and fairly by the whole Dominion. But while saying he was a party man he would also state that he did not take his motto from Yankeedom, or any other "Dom". He believed the interest of the State to be superior to party, and would vote accordingly.

Mr. Johnson was surprised to hear such an argument from a member of that House. (A voice—"Louder.") He thought he could make himself heard in that House, although judging honourable members by their statements, he doubted whether he could make himself understood. (Loud laughter.)

Hon. Mr. Smith contended that the River police should not be a charge on the Dominion. It did not seem to him that because the General Government had control over trade and navigation generally that the Government of Quebec could not from harbour dues and other sources raise enough to support these River Police.

Hon. Mr. Chauveau said the Dominion received the dues which ought to go to the support of this police. Hence the Dominion had to furnish this River Police.

Hon. Mr. Cartier said the term "River Police" was a misnomer. They should have been called "Government Police." The corporations of Quebec and Montreal had no jurisdiction on the water, could not protect property off the land. Hence the necessity for a system of Government police, with privileges to enable them to act in these cases. The river police were under the charge of Local Justices, Coursol & Maguire, but the expenses of the police were necessarily a charge on the Dominion. This was for the present, but hereafter the charge for the officers superintending would not be a charge on the Dominion. **Mr. Wood** opposed the vote, thinking it most extraordinary that there should be such a difference between land and sea in the matter of police.

Hon. Mr. Anglin took a similar view, and was glad to hear an explicit statement that hereafter the salaries of these justices would not be a charge on the Dominion.

Mr. Young contended that it was very unfair that the Government should pay for the police forces of one Province while the other Provinces paid for their police out of municipal funds. He hoped that these items would not appear in the estimates of next year.

The items, after further discussion, were agreed to.

On the item—Penitentiary, Kingston, \$130,561.

Hon. Mr. Anglin called attention to some extraordinary items in the public accounts under this head. One was a payment to Mr. Litchfield, for use of his horse and carriage for nine years, \$720. This looked like some of the jobs to which they had been accustomed in the Maritime Provinces before Confederation. Another was a payment to a Mr. MacDonell for seven years' services, \$2,800. Another clearing up of old scores was a payment to the warden for seven years' service in connection with Rockwood Asylum, \$2,800. He found also salaries of two chaplains at \$1,600 each; he thought this was a large amount. The allowance for the New Brunswick penitentiary, \$8,200, he thought was not enough.

Hon. Mr. Rose said the estimate of \$8,200 corresponded with the grant which had been usually given, and he had no other data to go on.

**Mr. Young** hoped some explanation would be given of the payments in the two cases for seven years' services.

Sir John A. Macdonald said this was the first time attention of the Finance Minister had been called to these payments, and he would make enquiries about them. He (Sir John) did not know anything about them. The salaries of the chaplains as given in these estimates were fixed by law, but they were considerably reduced in the resolutions he was to submit to the House in connection with his Penitentiary Bill.

Hon. Mr. Fisher considered the salaries of the chaplains were too high.

99038----33