

about 1,100, and had met wardens of other prisons in the State of New York. So far as that State was concerned the same rule applied as applied here, that rigid rules were necessary in the punishment of crime, and that hardened criminals could not be treated liberally. The disposition of all prisoners was to subvert discipline, and various modes of punishment had been tried in different prisons. In some the water cure was adopted, the prisoner being placed so that he could not move his hands, while a jet of water was poured on him. In other prisons the iron cap was used, weighing some 6 lb. or 8 lb., which prevented talking. In other places the dark cell and chains, the lash, or the iron rings were the means adopted to check insubordination. The iron ring was fastened directly opposite the prisoner's face and his feet rested on the floor. If a prisoner would not obey the rules he must be made to, but his provisions should be of a proper description. The tenders for provisions for the Central Prison were just the same as those for the other public institutions, and though tainted meat was occasionally found, as it was in private houses, it was always returned at once. (Hear, hear.) The same kind of meat which was eaten by the inmates was eaten by the officers. The dietary was of the most liberal kind, and every man was from 21 lbs. to 10 lbs and 25 lbs heavier when he left the institution than when he entered it. The following scale would show the kind of dietary allowed:—Breakfast, 9 ounces bread and 1 pint coffee every morning, and on four mornings of the week 8 ounces of meat and 8 ounces vegetables, made into hash; on two mornings, 4 ounces oatmeal made into porridge, with molasses, and one morning 4 ounces rice with molasses. Dinner, 9 ounces of bread every day, and on 3 days of the week 12 ounces meat and 12 ounces vegetables, on other 3 days one quart of soup made from 9 ounces of bones, 1 ounce of barley, and 12 ounces of vegetables, and on one day a quart of pea soup made from 9 ounces of bones and 8 ounces of peas. Supper, 12 ounces of bread every night and one pint of tea sweetened with brown sugar. A comparison of this dietary with what was allowed in English industrial prisons shows that 206 ounces of bread is given to the Central Prison per week, as compared with 148 ounces in England; 68 ounces of meat, as compared with 24 ounces; the same quantity of vegetables weekly, and about the same quantity of soup. Counting the weight of vegetables placed in the soup, the daily average weight of solids given to each prisoner was about 60 ounces, as compared with 45 ounces given in the Industrial Prisons in England. In fact it might be said, and an examination of the dietary list would confirm the statement, that prisoners who were kept at hard labour could eat. Some time ago the Government had entered into a contract with the Canada Car Company to give them prison labour in return for a certain payment per day for each prisoner so employed. The Government were therefore bound to see that the labour was performed, and it must be remembered that criminals were disposed to feign sickness and shirk work. The class of men in this prison were not those who had committed crime for the first time, but men of the most hardened character, many of whom had already served in the Penitentiary, and they had to be dealt with severely and promptly, and to be shown that discipline must be maintained and labour performed. There were only some 17 guards to more than 300 prisoners, and men who used profane language, or quarrelled, or created a riot, must be punished severely. Moral suasion would hardly do in such cases. The member for East Peterboro' would have made his speech more easily if he had read the extracts from a certain Toronto evening paper, of which his speech was really composed. Nearly every case to which the hon. gentleman had alluded had been investigated with witnesses sworn to tell the truth, and it had been found that the statements made had been altogether exaggerated. In reference to the statement that when Lewis went to the London Lunatic Asylum he bore marks of having been struck with a key, Dr. Lett stated that it was not true. (Hear, hear.) He objected to any hon. member attempting to damn the character of men holding positions under the Government without having the evidence before him. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman tried to blast the character of some of the best men in the country when they had no opportunity of reply, made a distorted, exaggerated

statement, and then demanded a Committee. If what he had said about McKelvin were true, it seemed a hard case. He was the first prisoner who died in the Central Prison. The hon. gentleman had made his principal case of this man, who, he said, had died without a doctor or a priest, and in reference to whom no coroner had been allowed to enter the prison. This matter occurred two years ago. McKelvin was taken suddenly ill at one o'clock. A doctor was sent for, but he died unexpectedly at half-past eight. It was a strict rule that when a prisoner was dangerously sick a minister should be sent for. The principle was recognised that when any of these hardened criminals fell ill they were no longer to be treated as criminals, but were entitled to every attention to which free men were entitled, and to have every assistance when death stared them in the face to prepare to meet their Maker. They knew that a Catholic considered it of much greater importance that in his last moments he should be attended by a priest than Protestants did, and the strictest instructions were given that when a Catholic was dangerously sick, a priest should be sent for at once. McKelvin died very suddenly, and if a priest were not sent for, it was because the Warden and the two principal officers were absent locking after two prisoners who had just escaped. A coroner's inquest was invariably held when a prisoner died, and in the Prison Inspector's report for 1875 it was stated that an inquest was held in the case of McKelvin. (Cheers.) Reference had been made to dismissed guards. The only way in which discipline could be maintained was by dismissing guards when they did not do their duty. Punctuality was essential under the rules, and insubordination or drunkenness was punished with instant dismissal. He challenged the member for East Peterboro' to mention a case in which a guard had been dismissed except for such reasons. A charge had been made that partiality was shown to Protestant guards, while Catholic guards did not receive fair treatment. If any officer had been guilty of such partiality he should recommend his dismissal. (Hear, hear.) But in the investigation the inevitable testimony was that no such difference in treatment had existed. The hon. member for East Peterboro' had assumed a responsibility which, perhaps, he did not really understand. He (Mr. Wood) did not now refer to charging people with wrongs of which they were not guilty, to charging want of discipline where there was good discipline, but to the effect of this debate in the Central Prison. Where prisoners were working in the shops with freedom, it was impossible that such debates as this should not become known to them. The fact that an investigation was being made had become known to them, and the result had been a meeting of the prisoners, which was only quelled by the determination of the Inspector, who very rightly had the lash applied to the few who finally remained refractory. It might be necessary to double the guards as the result of this debate, which was certain to become known to the prisoners. Mr. Stedman, against whom most of these charges had been directed, had been a first rate officer and a thorough disciplinarian, always on duty. His duty was to report those who did not conform to the rules, and no doubt he made enemies among the guards. There was a system of promotion which might have led some of them to conspire against the deputy chief guard, so that one of them might take his place. Mr. Stedman had been the man, in the cases of escaped or refractory prisoners, where nerve and strength were required, who had to be relied on. He had correctly kept the books, and had carefully, strictly, and zealously performed every part of his duty, in the opinion of the Warden and Dr. Aikens. He was, in his (Mr. Wood's) opinion, over zealous and over-severe in his desire to enforce the rules, but Dr. Aikens—a man of unblemished reputation and high standing, socially and professionally—had given him an excellent character. He contended that it was not fair for the hon. gentleman to move for a Committee now, knowing as he did that the evidence taken by the Commission would be seen in the hands of every member. There could be no doubt that the punishment of the prisoners was a matter which should be left in the hands of the Warden. In New York State they had local boards to whom severe punishments had first to be referred, but the system had been found to work badly, and the sole charge of the discipline, manage-