

the necessity or propriety of appointing a Committee to enquire either into the internal management of, or any other matters connected with, the Central Prison."

Mr. BELL said he believed the character of the newspaper in which these charges had appeared was both mendacious and sensational, and if there was no other authority than that paper for those or any other statements he could see no reason for further enquiry. He contended, however, that there was sufficient ground even in the Provincial Secretary's Report for a Committee of investigation, as cases of cruelty were admitted in that report.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that he would have put off his motion in order that the documents produced by the Government might be before the House, only that these papers were so long delayed. He repeated some of his charges of cruelty, and said he was in favour of using the lash but not of using it to a degree approaching barbarity.

Mr. CREIGHTON thought the hon. member for Brant had thrown too much ridicule upon the matter. He hoped that politics had no influence in the internal discipline of the prison. He considered the investigation was not full enough to satisfy the House or the country.

Mr. WILSON thought that those who had conducted the examination should be held to be beyond suspicion, and believed that the investigation was a fair and impartial one. He entertained no sympathy with the gentleman who brought this motion, seeing that he had not presented evidence to show that the motion was warranted. He referred to the investigation into the conduct of McCordless in regard to the Model Farm, and said that on that occasion the Opposition had held McCordless up to the House as a highly-deserving and very much persecuted individual. His evidence had at first been put forward without question, but the time came when those gentlemen in the House who had espoused his cause became heartily ashamed of themselves. (Hear, hear.) He feared that such would be the result in the present instance.

Mr. BRODER held that there was good ground for an investigation by a Parliamentary Committee, even if they had no further basis for such a course than the Provincial Secretary's report.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN wished to say, in reference to some remarks he had previously made, that he had no intention of accusing the Commissioner of Public Works of being responsible in any way for wrong doing in the Central Prison.

Mr. BAXIER said he had no sympathy with those who advocated a gingerly treatment of hardened criminals. It was a very common thing for these lazy criminals to fatten upon the food which was provided for them in the various prisons, and he had no doubt that the victuals given the prisoners in the Central Prison were good enough for them. He could see no necessity for appointing a Committee, at least before the evidence taken by the Commission was brought down.

Mr. CAMERON said, with reference to the charge that a coroner had been refused admission into the Central Prison, that if it was untrue it should have been explicitly denied by the Provincial Secretary. The evidence of criminals was allowed in Courts of Law, and it was no answer to the present charges to say that the evidence was that of discharged criminals. With regard to Beaumont, if he had been guilty of stealing the money of prisoners, why had not the Government brought him to punishment? It would be a most unlikely thing that the officials of the prison would make charges against their superior officers, even upon the assurance that their evidence would not affect their standing, knowing that if such charges were made their future services might be rendered very uncomfortable. There was a feeling in the country that there had been gross cruelty practised in the institution, and even a partial enquiry before the close of the session would be better than allowing such a feeling as he had mentioned to continue. The report of the Inspector of Asylums showed that Mr. Langmuir was desirous to hold the bad conduct of some of the officials of the institution, and went very far to substantiate the charge which had been made. The Opposition had no desire to make political capital out of the matter, but if the Government refused an investigation, on their shoulders would be the responsibility.

Mr. FRASER said that it was very evident that the Opposition were very anxious that they might have an incomplete investigation when the end of the session arrived, so that

on the strength of such witnesses as Mr. Beaumont they might have something which would serve them in good stead as an election cry. The honourable member for East Toronto had pretended that it was in the interests of humanity and not for political purposes that he sought for an inquiry; but if so the very same feeling should have prevented him from flinging such charges as he had against so efficient and able an officer as the Inspector of Asylums. If the hon. gentleman had been actuated by the high motives which he claimed he would not have attempted to fish from such an officer his good name in the manner he had; for he must have known that Mr. Langmuir was a man of too much integrity to be guilty of any such conduct as had been charged against him in order to shield the Government. He (Mr. Fraser) wished to remind him also that the Inspector of Asylums had not been appointed to his office by the present Government, but that was of little importance compared with the fact that he was one who had always proved himself to be an honest man and a capable officer. (Hear, hear.) If it had been shown that the Government, after hearing these rumours regarding the state of affairs in the Central Prison, had been anxious to suppress an inquiry or slow in moving in the matter, there might have been some foundation for the appointment of a Committee. But just as soon as they had heard the charges the Government had made a thorough, complete, and accurate investigation. It had occupied the Provincial Secretary's time for nearly three weeks; he had often gone to the Prison at 10 in the morning and worked until midnight. What reason was there for supposing that an investigation conducted by a member of the Government, at which every man who could give testimony was present and put under oath, should not be a thorough and satisfactory one? It was objected that the investigation took place in the presence of the Warden. It was the first time he had heard it stated as a principle of the hon. gentleman that a man should be tried behind his back.

Mr. CAMERON said he sat as a judge.

Mr. FRASER said he did not sit as a judge.

Mr. CAMERON said the Warden sat beside the Provincial Secretary instead of at the bottom of the table.

Mr. FRASER said it now appeared that hon. gentlemen wanted a Committee because Captain Prince committed the terrible offence of "sitting beside the Provincial Secretary." (Laughter.) The hon. member had better move an amendment to the amendment calling for an enquiry as to whether the Warden "sat beside the Provincial Secretary." (Hear, hear.) It happened, however, that he did not. The hon. member for East Toronto had talked in *non prois* style about the poor fellow who was fastened to the ring for 72 hours. He believed this was one O'Staughnessy, and his hon. friend from Kingston declared that a greater rascal never hailed from that city. After his punishment, however, he turned out to be one of the best conducted men in the prison. (Hear, hear.) The man about whom the hon. gentleman made the greatest difficulty was Stedman, who had resigned because the Provincial Secretary found that he had been unnecessarily severe. It was not denied that in some cases perhaps one of cooler blood, though a less efficient officer, might not have acted as Stedman had done. But it must be recollected that in this prison were over 300 of the worst characters in the Province of Ontario. It was not simply the man who stole a loaf of bread, as the hon. gentleman had said, to save a starving wife who was sent there, but far worse criminals.

Mr. CAMERON—They ought to be sent to the Penitentiary.

Mr. FRASER said the hon. gentleman was now blaming the judges for sending these men to the Central Prison. Men were there who had been in gaol many times, and many who had been already in the Penitentiary. If there was one thing more necessary than another in dealing with such men with a small staff of guards, it was that there should be strict discipline. (Hear, hear.) He had heard complaints made that the guards were armed with rifles and revolvers when on duty. What, he asked, would become of the seventeen or eighteen guards in the Prison if the prisoners did not understand that they had weapons? There would be insubordination within an hour, as there was when the men believed this maudlin sympathy existed for criminals who were better fed, better clothed, and better housed than the ordinary poor population of this country. And yet here were some of the people's representatives, instead of supporting