

it would be impossible to reduce the staff and carry on the public business satisfactorily.

Mr. MILLER, from personal experience, declared that no class of men worked harder or more assiduously than the civil servants, and he protested against the constant attacks made on that useful class.

In reply to Mr. LAUDER,

Mr. WOOD said that Mr. Stedman, who had resigned his position in the Central Prison, was a Conservative, as were all his friends as far as he (Mr. Wood) knew. He had been a very deserving and efficient officer, notwithstanding that he might have been unnecessarily severe in some cases, as he (Mr. Wood) had stated in his report. Feeling that under such circumstances it would have been unfair to have thrown him entirely out of employment in the middle of winter, and when he had a family to provide for in exceptionally hard times, he (Mr. Wood) had got him appointed in the Treasurer's Department in connection with the License Branch. He had also in that capacity proved himself a most efficient officer, and if the Government decided to continue his services an appropriation would be asked in the supplementary estimates.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

The House again went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMERON said that Mr. Stedman had, it was alleged, been guilty of gross cruelty in the Central Prison. If he was so guilty he was deserving of censure; if he was not, his forced resignation—perhaps to save some one else from blame—was unjust.

Mr. WOOD said the hon. gentleman was entirely incorrect in both of his suppositions, as he had neither been discharged for gross cruelty, nor to shelter any one else.

Mr. MILLER said that while he was perfectly satisfied with what the Government had done thus far in the Stedman matter, he was opposed to their keeping him in his present position much longer.

Mr. CLARKE said that there was a feeling among the Inspectors of Licenses that it was unfair that a man in Mr. Stedman's position should be placed over all their heads.

Mr. MOWAT said that a great deal of the feeling in the country about Mr. Stedman had arisen from the exaggerated reports published about him in the Conservative newspapers. There was an impression abroad about him which the Government did not endorse. It was one thing to say that a man's mode of discipline was too severe—as might be said of many a school teacher for instance—but it was quite another to say that he was totally unfit for any position in the Government service. The opinion he (Mr. Mowat) had formed after hearing all the circumstances from the Provincial Secretary was that Mr. Stedman was an unusually able officer in almost every respect. It was a mistake to suppose that Mr. Stedman had been placed over the heads of the other Inspectors; he had no kind of superintendence or authority over them. The Government had no special interest in appointing Mr. Stedman to his present office if he was not efficient, for he had no political sympathy with them, but if they could not be trusted with the appointment of a temporary officer, such as this was, the sooner they left their present places the better (Hear, hear.) It was very unfair for hon. members to repeat these charges when all the papers regarding the case would soon be in their hands.

Mr. LAUDER said he did not believe that spies sent to the country districts to carry out the License Law would be very serviceable.

Mr. CAMERON said it was very suspicious that Mr. Stedman should have been appointed to this office.

The item then passed with a reduction of \$200, owing to an error in printing the estimates.

The following items also passed:—

Secretary and Registrar's Office, \$21,100.

Department of Agriculture, \$1,200.

On the item of \$1,400 for Immigration,

Mr. CAMERON said he thought the Estimates should be postponed till the Public Accounts were brought down.

Mr. CURRIE said he rather agreed with the remark of the hon. gentleman, but the Government of which he was a member had never brought down the Public Accounts for one year until after the estimates for the

next year had been passed.

Mr. MOWAT said it was an exceptional thing to stay the estimates till the Accounts for the previous year were brought down. The greatest exertions were being made to prepare the Accounts, and they would be down very shortly.

The item was postponed.

The item of \$6,650 for Public Institutions also passed.

On the item of \$10,210 for miscellaneous expenditure for civil government,

Mr. MERRICK said, as law stamps were abolished, he thought the Division Court Inspector's duties must be very light. He did not see the necessity for retaining the officer.

Mr. CURRIE concurred in the view of the hon. gentleman opposite, inasmuch as this officer was intended to prevent frauds in the matter of stamps, which had now been abolished. He hoped the item would be struck out before concurrence.

Mr. WOOD gave statistics from the returns made by Inspectors, showing that in only a very few of the Division Court offices were the books kept according to law. The inspection was very necessary, and had accomplished much good.

Mr. MCLEOD thought that it was time that the whole conduct of the Division Courts should be under the control of the Government.

Mr. MILLER said that in his opinion there was a great necessity for Division Court Inspectors, and he only wished they had greater powers than they had now. Great benefits had resulted from inspection.

Mr. MERRICK expressed the belief that the object of the Government was to find such faults with the Division Court clerks that it would be found necessary to have them appointed by the Government, and thus throw more patronage into their hands. At present if the clerks did not pay over money to suitors, the Government could not ascertain the fact.

Mr. WOOD said that in the majority of cases the Inspectors could ascertain if such moneys were paid over or not.

Mr. DEACON said that if Division Court clerks and bailiffs failed to pay over the proper amounts to suitors, their securities could be held liable. These Courts were doing a large amount of useful work.

Mr. BETHUNE believed that though the office may have been necessary at one time, it was not so now. He believed that the County Judges or the County Attorney might make an inspection of the Division Court Offices. They were perfectly competent to do so, and it was not beneath their dignity. He also thought the Inspector of Registry Offices might be dispensed with, or at least one officer might discharge the duties of both offices.

Mr. FERRIS considered the Inspector of Registry Offices one of the most important offices in the country. He believed these inspectors were very useful officials. The Government, however, ought to insist upon the records of the Division Courts being kept safely.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) said he should vote for the appointment of the Division Court Inspector every year until Division Courts were for ever abolished. (Laughter.)

Mr. ROSS supported the continuance of the Inspectors.

Mr. HARGRAFT thought the Government should insist on a yearly report from the Inspector of Division Courts.

Mr. BUNTER believed the two offices might be amalgamated. He thought the Division Court jurisdiction might very well be extended. To impose on the county judges the additional duty of inspecting the Division Courts would be a move in the wrong direction, as was seen by the conduct of the county judge in Lincoln.

Mr. KAY contended that Division Courts were of very great service to the poor, and protested against the manner in which they had been referred to. He believed the Inspectors ought to be continued as neither county judges nor crown attorneys could properly discharge the duties.

Mr. CAMERON said that if there was any neglect of duty on the part of bailiffs and clerks there was a remedy at law. He believed if the Provincial Secretary were to request the Judges to see that the books of these offices were according to law, they would cheerfully do so. It would be a most dangerous thing to throw the appointments of the bailiffs and Division Court clerks