

Where the State Wastes Labour

CANADA has a little army of two thousand men working in her seven penitentiaries, and they cannot earn even their board and lodging. Suppose those two thousand men were handed over to a railway contractor or a lumberman, how much money would he make out of them? Let us suppose they were drawing wages from such an employer. They would get, at the lowest calculation, \$1.50 a day. That would amount to \$3,000 a day. For three hundred days in the year, the total wage bill of the contractor would be \$900,000.

Putting it another way, suppose the contractor boarded, lodged and clothed them, and paid the balance in wages, what would he pay? He could board and lodge them at five dollars a week and give them the best accommodation they could possibly require. The total board bill would be \$260 a year, or a total board bill for two thousand men amounting to \$520,000. He could clothe them better than the prison authorities clothe them at \$50 a year, or another \$100,000. These two items make a total of \$620,000. If their labour was worth \$900,000, he would have a balance of \$280,000 to pay the 2,000 men at the end of the year, or one hundred and forty dollars each.

Now, compare this with what the Dominion of Canada does with this little army. Last year the total cost to the Government was as follows:

Kingston	\$121,076.44
St. Vincent de Paul	138,796.08
Dorchester	76,746.68
Manitoba	64,743.23
British Columbia	102,080.38
Alberta	75,193.40
Saskatchewan	53,610.44

Total\$632,246.65

Thus instead of making \$280,000 a year out of their labour, the Government pays out, net, \$632,246. The total loss on this labour is thus \$632,246 plus the \$280,000 of profit a contractor would have made, or a total of \$912,246. A loss to the Government and the labourers of nearly a million dollars a year.

DID you ever hear of anything so ridiculous? Here is an army of men who are capable of work, who are willing to work, who would be benefited by work, and who are given to the Government to manage, and who so manage them as to lose over \$900,000 a year. Is it any wonder that some people lose faith in government by political parties? Where is the money wasted? In the first place

Sinful Squandering in the Penitentiaries of Canada

By NORMAN PATTERSON

the staffs are unnecessarily expensive. For every convict confined in Kingston Penitentiary, the staff oversight cost \$178.87. In Dorchester, Man., it costs \$210.61. In Saskatchewan it costs \$366.96. What wonderful oversight they must give in the latter institution when it costs \$366 a year to "oversee" each and every prisoner. They have a warden at \$2,200, a surgeon at \$1,200, an accountant at \$1,200, two chaplains at \$800 each, a hospital overseer at \$900, a steward at \$900, an engineer at \$1,000, seven trade instructors at \$800, a deputy warden at \$1,500, a chief watchman at \$900, another watchman at \$750, and twelve keepers and guards, besides several temporary officers. All this to look after an average of about eighty prisoners. Isn't a government a wonderful thing?

TAKING Saskatchewan as the worst example of how to squander the people's money, the total cost per prisoner is \$700. This is made up as follows:

Staff	\$366.96 per capita.
Maintenance of convicts	85.61 "
Discharge expenses	9.72 "
Working expenses	96.57 "
Industries	1.79 "
Lands, buildings, and equipment ...	172.09 "
Miscellaneous	8.86 "

Less revenue 41.02 "

Net cost\$700.58 "

Now what do the two inspectors, Messrs. Stewart and Hughes, say to this:

"The fact that each man sentenced to hard labour costs the country a dollar per day in excess of his earning seems to require explanation." These two officials are quite right. It is a circumstance which is greatly in need of explanation. Every thinking citizen will agree with them in that statement. Their second statement is equally worthy of record:

"We respectfully submit the opinion that the weakness which has produced such results is not due to the inefficiency of the officers by whom the institutions are primarily controlled, but to the policy by which those officers have been restricted."

They thus place the blame on the Minister of Jus-

tice—the head of the department. They go farther and make two recommendations:

"1. That the penitentiaries shall be administered by the minister through his responsible officers, and free from local or other external interference.

"2. That the Government shall utilize the obligatory labour of its wards in supplying, so far as possible, its own needs and requirements."

Not content with this hammering, they go even farther. They reproduce a report made in 1909, pointing out how prison labour could be utilized to advantage, indicating that the information has been in the department for at least four years—two years under Liberal rule and two years under Conservative rule.

These men deliberately and expressly charge the Government before 1911, and the Government since 1911, with extravagance and a waste of public money.

NOW, what are these recommendations which have been made from time to time for ten years, and which, had they been adopted, might have saved Canada five million dollars? They are briefly to the effect that certain Government supplies, instead of being bought from contractors, should be made in the prisons. They include:

"1. Brooms, mops, scrubbing brushes and door-mats for all public buildings.

"2. Letter-carriers' uniforms (including caps and boots).

"3. Rural mail boxes.

"4. Uniforms for employees of the government railways, fishery protection service and railway mail service.

"5. Overcoats for the militia.

"6. Boots and uniforms for the Dominion police and undress uniform (stable suits) for the R. N. W. M. Police."

The other day, the Postmaster-General ordered 100,000 rural mail delivery boxes at \$4.25 each, a total of \$425,000. Yet here on the official files was an offer to make them in the penitentiaries and save the country at least two-thirds of the cost.

BUT enough. The Dominion Government is apparently the most extravagant institution in this country. It prefers to keep its prisoners in idleness, rather than give them honest employment. It prefers to make criminals rather than mend criminals. It ignores the recommendations of its own officials. It ignores the humanitarian principles involved. It maintains, for political reasons, the worst penitentiary system in the Anglo-Saxon world.

Fort Howe Now a Dominion Park

By A. M. BELDING

HISTORIC old Fort Howe, which overlooks the city of St. John, N.B., and which looked down on stirring events in early Acadian history, and whose guns boomed out a welcome to the Loyalists at the close of the American Revolution, is to be made a Dominion Park. In 1911, Hon. William Pugsley, then Minister of Public Works, sent an engineer to St. John to survey the commanding height and report upon the possibility of converting it into a public park. The report was entirely favourable, but no action was then taken. In 1912, Mr. J. B. Harkin, Dominion Commissioner of Parks and Playgrounds, wrote Miss Mabel Peters, president of the St. John Playgrounds Association, asking what historic spots or battlefields there were in New Brunswick which might be converted into public recreation grounds. Miss Peters at once commended Fort Howe to his attention, and brought the matter before the executive of the association, which not only endorsed the proposition, but communicated with other organizations asking their co-operation. As a result the Playgrounds Association, the Historical Society, the Men's and Women's Canadian Clubs and other organizations prepared resolutions, appointed a joint committee, pressed the matter upon the government at Ottawa, enlisted the sympathy and aid of Hon. J. D. Hazen, and were so successful in their efforts that the Government sent Col. Rogers to survey the hill, which is the property of the Militia Department, and upon his favourable report it was decided to create there a Dominion Park.

FORT HOWE was established in 1777, by Major Studholme, who had seen service on the St. John River, and who brought the materials for the Fort around from Halifax. At that time strenuous efforts were being made by Col. Allan and others to induce the Indians and settlers along the St. John River to join forces with the Americans; and raiding parties from the port of Machias in Maine had been doing much damage to the property of loyal settlers along the river and at its mouth. Major Studholme quickly put an end to these incursions, and at a famous treaty made near Fort Howe the Indians pledged their allegiance to the King. Major Studholme was in command at the Fort when the Loyalists came, in 1783, and founded the city of St. John, and he rendered great service in getting the settlers



Old Fort Howe, overlooking the harbour of St. John, which is to be made into a Dominion Park. The old Fort was established six years before the United Empire Loyalists founded the City of St. John.
Photograph by Erb & Sons.

located along the fertile valley of the St. John River. Fort Howe was named after the commander of the forces in America at the time of the revolution. William Cobbett, the famous English author and publicist, was once a soldier in garrison at Fort Howe, and there met the woman who afterward in England became his wife. A well near the old Fort,

at which tradition says they often met in their days of courtship, is still known as Cobbett's Well. Much that is of great historic interest centres around the Fort, which commands a splendid view of the city, the harbour and surrounding country. The example of Fort Howe might well be followed in many other places that have helped to make Canadian history.