

and that volumes specially valuable should be kept under lock and key there, a person engaged in researches, and wishing to consult a rare volume, could see it on applying to the Librarian. But if you are going to have these works kept in the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Archives, this will just cause confusion and render the whole collection less valuable than it would be if we had it entire in the Library. I, therefore, ask for more definite information in regard to this vote. Is it intended that any of the money shall be expended in the purchase of books which Parliament declares ought to be in our Library, and for the purchase of which we are granting special votes in order to complete the collection? There seems to be no sense in that; it is quite unreasonable; and for my part, there is no doubt as to the preferable one of the two places. The manuscripts I am not objecting to be kept by the Archivist, but the printed books should be in the Library, and should not be duplicated elsewhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, as a general rule, printed books should be kept in the Library; but there are some books which, though printed, are so completely of the nature of Archives, from their scarcity and their antiquity, that perhaps there might be a line drawn. I must say that the books in our Library are not very safe; that there is a very considerable percentage of losses in the Library. Books at all valuable as Archives—scarce books, old books—would be safer in manuscript than in print. But with the single exception I have mentioned, I think historical books should be kept in the library.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it would never do, and the Committee recognized that it would never do, to keep these books on the ordinary shelves. The Librarian was directed to have a special department for them, kept under lock and key, out of which they would only be taken when they were specially wanted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the line taken by the hon. gentleman, and I will take an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. DAVIES. In the Library Committee this question came up and the Librarian, in making his report, stated that he had frequently failed to obtain rare books in reference to Canada, because another Department of the Government had forestalled him in every market into which he went. It was therefore thought proper to bring this question up in the House, because it was felt to be unseemly that the agent of one Department of the Government, when he went to buy a rare book, should find another agent of another Department of the Government bidding over his head.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is very absurd.

Mr. DAVIES. In the case of a sale of rare books in Toronto, I understand that the Librarian sent an officer there, but the Department of Agriculture had got ahead of him by telegraphing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the books were got, and there was really no competing and no loss.

Mr. DAVIES. The Department of Agriculture paid more for the books than they might, because the two were bidding against each other. This rivalry ought to be stopped altogether.

Mr. MILLS. This fact, I think, is sufficient to show the propriety of the suggestion I brought under the notice of the First Minister, a few days ago, that is, to have the Archives placed in connection with the Library. The principle on which Mr. Brymner is acting is, to seek to make the Department of which he is in charge a complete historical department for the Dominion of Canada. With that view, he is endeavouring to collect there every historical work relating to the Dominion, whether in manuscript or not, so

that any one wishing to look up any matter connected with the early history of any of the Provinces, might find everything he desired in that Department. If there was some part of the Library set apart for the Archives, and placed under the charge of Mr. Brymner, these books might be classified and the difficulties of which my hon. friend has spoken could not arise. There would be no competition, for whatever was done for the one would, in fact, be done for the other.

Patent Record..... \$9,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes the increase in the vote for the *Patent Record*?

Mr. McLELAN. It is to provide for the increased work. There is an expenditure in connection with every patent issued for engravings, &c. The revenue is increasing in a greater proportion. Since 1878 the number of patents issued has doubled and the revenue has increased from \$33,663, in 1878, to \$73,023, last year.

Criminal Statistics..... \$4,000 00

Mr. MILLS. I have in my hand a volume of these Criminal Statistics, and I am certain that if any member of the Administration would look at it, he would see that it has really no value whatever, that the information is altogether unreliable and the classification very imperfect. In Essex I find 685 persons charged with crime. The number acquitted is 85, leaving 600 convicted, but the list shows only 575 convicted, so that there are 25 unaccounted for. Take the classification of sentences; the number of persons does not correspond with either of these numbers. One of the purposes of a classification is to ascertain the character of crimes committed, whether very serious or comparatively trifling offences. Yet you find, in many instances, a large number of persons said to be convicted and not reported as having been sentenced at all. In Frontenac, out of 770 charged with crime during the year, 242 were acquitted, which would leave 528 convicted. Yet there are only 520 convicted, and less than 300 reported as having been sentenced. In Huron, the number of persons charged with assault is 168, of which seven were acquitted, leaving 161 convicted, yet the number reported as convicted is only 158, and the number sentenced is eight, leaving 153 unaccounted for. With regard to larceny, sixty were charged and twenty-four reported acquitted, leaving thirty-six as convicted; yet only twenty-nine were reported convicted, and thirteen sentenced, leaving twenty-three unaccounted for. In the case of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, ninety-one were charged with the offence, and none acquitted, yet we have twenty-six reported sentenced, leaving sixty-three not accounted for. For infraction of by-laws, 148 were charged and two acquitted, leaving 146 convicted; but 143 are reported as convicted and sixty-four sentenced; thus, eighty-two are not reported at all. So that the classification of these is wholly worthless. Then, in the county of York, I find 375 charged with common assault, 136 acquitted, and 239 convicted, but the number reported convicted is only 224, and the number reported sentenced 135; thus, eighty-four are unaccounted for. Murder—six charged and three acquitted, leaving three convicted. Three are reported convicted, but none are reported sentenced, and the punishment in no case is stated. The number charged with drunkenness and disorderly conduct in that county reaches 3,373, of which 1,487 are acquitted, leaving 1,786 convicted but only 1,737 are reported sentenced or forty-nine altogether unaccounted for. Misdemeanours—seventy-nine charged and twelve acquitted; sixty-seven convicted, yet only fifty-three are reported as convicted and twenty-nine as sentenced, leaving twenty-eight unaccounted for. I might go through the whole of this volume, and in scarcely a county will you find a report at all reliable. The classification, such as it is, is altogether