

not pull down the brick work in the manner he had seen it in other prisons. Mr. Tully did not agree with witness and his view was adopted. When Mr. Mackenzie came into the Government he called attention to this defect, and witness informed him that he had pointed out the objection, but had been overruled. The Government then considered it necessary to have this stone work inserted, and gave orders for it being done. New works connected with the Central Prison had greatly increased the cost. As the original scheme of having prisons at three points in the Province had been abandoned, and probably would not be revived, he thought it necessary to make an addition of 84 cells. He saw that this work could be done at a less cost than by the erection of a new building when actually required in as much as the foundations and roof had to be constructed. He thought fully one-half was saved by placing another tier of cells in the Prison. The criminal statistics of that year, 1872, seemed to justify an extension of the Prison. He thought these cells, for which an appropriation of \$18,000 had been made, would cost about \$25,000, owing to the increased cost of stone-work and other things.

Some discussion took place as to whether Mr. Langmuir should be permitted to continue to make a statement, and the Chairman ruled that the evidence was of an important character, and that it was due to the witness himself that it should be proceeded with.

Hon. Mr. FRASER said he would take the responsibility of questioning witness in this respect. Witness, continuing, said that the railway tracks cost \$10,858, and that only \$15,000 were allowed for the building of the walls in the original estimate of \$150,000. He afterwards found, upon visiting similar institutions in the States, that the enclosed space must be very largely increased; and, in order to provide for that addition, the sum of \$25,000 was appropriated. This made altogether \$40,000 for walls. At that time the walls were to be built of stone, but the contractor claimed he could not have built them of that material for \$40,000. Witness then suggested that a cheaper class of walls might be used, and he showed that the walls of the prisons in the United States were mostly built of brick, and that a saving of \$20,000 would be effected by the adoption of this suggestion. The suggestion was adopted, so that \$10,000 only, in addition to the original \$15,000, would be required for the construction of the walls. These additional items of expenditure were the chief causes of the Central Prison costing so much over the estimate of \$150,000. The repairing the injury done by the late storm would be altogether additional. He believed the whole cost of erection of the Central Prison would be from \$375,000 to \$390,000. When the Government took charge of the work there was quite an advance in the cost of the work on the contract price. The Government could not complete the work at the schedule rates. In the original contract provision was made for a common warehouse, but that building was changed into a foundry, and cost about \$8,000 or \$9,000 extra. Under the Sandfield Macdonald Government dry-goods were not tendered for. The custom then was the same as at present. They always tendered for flour, butter, fuel, and butchers' meat.

Mr. CAMERON desired Mr. Langmuir to make a statement of the goods purchased without contracts being entered into under the Sandfield Macdonald Government, and a statement also of goods similarly purchased under the present Government.

By Mr. FRASER.—All the articles he purchased for the Central Prison would not come under the head of Maintenance. For instance, anything in the way of substantial furniture would not. He thought the system of going into the market and buying as a merchant would, had resulted in great saving to the Province. He stated as evidence of this, that although everything had advanced in price, the cost per head of maintaining the inmates of the Public Institutions had been reduced from \$148 to \$125 per annum. Mr. McMaster had offered to buy the blankets purchased by the Government at an advance of 75c per pair. He had had large experience, extending over 20 years, in making these purchases; they had never had clothing made by contract. Some clothing had been made previously, he believed, but no tenders were asked for. He recommended Mr. Wilkie should have the contract for the gates; because he was the trades instructor in the blacksmith's shop at Penetanguishene. When it was contemplated to enlarge the Reformatory at Penetanguishene by adding a wing to it, it was decided to have the iron gates and fanlights made at the Reformatory.

He told Wilkie to go on with the gates, and he did so; but witness, on visiting Reformatories in the United States, finding there they did away with prison surrounds as much as possible, thought they might use common doors of a strong kind, and utilize the iron gates for the Central Prison. He found, on inspecting the gates, they were very defective, and suggested improvements to Wilkie, which he carried out to his (witness's) satisfaction. The gates cost about \$16 50 delivered in Toronto. After these gates were made, the Warden of the Reformatory and Wilkie quarrelled about some matter of discipline. The cause of the quarrel was reported to him, and he approved of the dispensing with the services of Wilkie, who on coming to Toronto, asked if he could continue to make cell gates, and witness told him he would have to see the Commissioner of Public Works and make an offer in writing. After that he made a tender, and witness knowing he had done so well in making the gates at Penetanguishene, and that he was a good workman, recommended the acceptance of the tender. He ordered the cell gates to be made at Penetanguishene principally to employ the boys. A tender was received from Mr. Edwards, of Montreal, to make the gates for \$24. The gates made by Wilkie cost only \$16 apiece. Mr. Edwards' offer would amount to about 15 cents. Mr. Wilkie's contract was consequently considerably less. Witness presented to the Committee a return showing that the appropriation in regard to certain items had been exceeded.

The Committee adjourned at 2:15.