

terms of imprisonment for stealing soldiers' clothing. He (Mr. Wood) submitted, that while Beaumont might possibly have remained in the regiment, or by subsequent service might have entitled himself to recommendations, on the other hand the charge against him in the Central Prison of having taken money, the fact that the money was missing, that he denied having received it at Hamilton, that it was proven that he had received it, backed by the evidence which had been received as to his theft in the Old Country—these facts were sufficient to justify him (Mr. Wood) in all he had said or done. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MEREDITH—What is the date of the Old Country prosecution?

Mr. WOOD said it was a blank form filled up with an extract from conviction and dated Perth, May 3, 1861. With reference to the charge of cruelty, the hon. member for East Toronto said that he had evidence outside of that of dismissed guards and prisoners.

Mr. SPEAKER hoped the hon. gentleman would confine himself strictly to a reply.

Mr. WOOD said that the hon. member for East Toronto had made a number of charges without having proper evidence, and he (Mr. Wood) hoped he would be allowed to reply to these charges. If the hon. gentleman imagined for a moment that the Government had the slightest fear of a fair and full investigation, he was very greatly mistaken. (Hear, hear.) If he fancied that there was anything which they desired to conceal, anything that might turn up of which they had the slightest fear, he was entirely in error. (Hear, hear.) What the Government claimed was, that having made a most searching investigation, as would appear when the evidence was brought down, it was unfair to make serious charges when that evidence was not before the House and country, and to make these charges on hearsay evidence. The hon. gentleman had spoken of the Central Prison being made a kind of reformatory. Whatever might have been the original intention, he (Mr. Wood) was quite sure that it never could be made anything of the kind. It was quite impossible to make a prison in which criminals who had formerly been in penitentiaries and State Prisons were confined for terms of three or six months, anything like a reformatory. Nothing but the strictest discipline would answer in such an institution. While the Government was quite satisfied to assume the responsibility of what they had done, believing that they had acted in the interests of the public in seeing that crime was properly punished and that the institution was kept as a model one, they contended that the member for East Toronto had assumed a position that was most prejudicial to the interests of Toronto. While he had attempted to defend the characters of some of the citizens of Toronto, he had not spared the characters of others whose feelings and reputations were just as deserving of protection as hon. gentlemen inside the House. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The hon. gentleman, as an experienced criminal lawyer, knew well how wrong and unfair it was to condemn a person unheard, how dishonourable it was to convict a person on hearsay evidence. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He (Mr. Cameron) knew very well how often it happened that those against whom circumstantial evidence seemed to point very strongly were found to be entirely innocent. He (Mr. Wood) would like to ask that hon. gentleman if he thought his course was an honourable, manly, and straightforward one—one which would reflect credit upon himself as a member of this House and a member of the community—when on the strength of hearsay evidence, and the testimony of discharged officials, without having the whole case before him, he attempted to damn the character of such men as Capt. Prince, the Inspector of Prisons, or others in the public institutions of the Province? Could he justify his conduct in attempting to do this merely to make a point against the Government of the day? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He (Mr. Wood) believed he had naturally a considerable amount of charity, but it was too much to ask any man, however charitable, to believe that the conduct of the hon. member in regard to this matter was based entirely on the desire to do justice to Beaumont. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Wood) did not wish to impute motives, but he was very much afraid that the hon. gentleman thought he could manage to leave a stain, an imputation, or a reflection after his re-

marks which would tend to damage the Government. (Hear.) Though the hon. gentleman came forward with all sorts of horrible stories of cruelties perpetrated in the Central Prison, he (Mr. Wood) was inclined to think that he knew little or nothing of what was the practice in any of the prisons of the United States, or other countries. Had he taken the trouble to investigate the discipline at the prisons at Auburn, Buffalo, or in the State of Ohio? Did he know anything of what punishment was inflicted in these institutions? On the contrary, he (Mr. Wood) feared the hon. gentleman knew very little about the matter, and yet he came forward to-night and charged that unheard-of acts of cruelty had been committed in the Central Prison. Such a course was scarcely fair—scarcely what ought to be expected from one occupying the position of the hon. member for East Toronto. (Cheers.) He hoped the hon. gentleman would amend his motion so that all the evidence should be brought down, not only with regard to McKelvey, but to all others who had died at the institution.

Mr. CAMERON said the hon. gentleman might move his amendment to the motion if he chose. He (Mr. Cameron) wished to say that he had not alluded to Captain Prince directly or indirectly. He had simply stated that some one must be responsible for the cruelty. He had been charged with a desire to find a ground of attack upon the Government. He had no desire of making any such attack without having a good foundation; but if there was found to be unnecessary cruelty in any of the public institutions, it was his duty as a member of the House to bring it to the attention of the Legislature. He knew more about the management of the Central Prison than the hon. gentleman thought. What he charged was that excessive cruelty was practised in this prison without the Warden being aware of the fact. Hon. gentlemen knew that the rules of the prison had not been carried out. It was no part of Beaumont's duty to take charge of the prisoners' money. When Beaumont left he told the Warden that he wished him to examine into everything under his charge; yet after he left other persons had access to the property that had been under his charge. The hon. gentleman defended the guard Beaumont from the suspicion that he had appropriated the prisoners' money, and proceeded to say that McKelvey, while ill, was forced to work, and then sent back to his cell to die like a dog. If the Government denied this to be true, he had the evidence of men who had Captain Prince's certificate of character. The circumstances showed there was mismanagement somewhere, and if this was the fault of Captain Prince, he should be removed. He might think him an excellent man, and wish him to get off scot free, but he had stronger reasons for desiring at the head of the prison a man who would protect the prisoners from oppression, while preserving the prison discipline. After finding the records falsified, he could not be content unless an enquiry were made. The hon. gentleman might say what he pleased about the responsibility of the position he was assuming; he was willing to assume that responsibility. There was no man in the Central Prison who would feel one word he said as intended to prevent him from being subjected to proper discipline, but he wished such to feel that a prisoner was still regarded as a man and that his rights would not be trampled upon. The man McKelvey who met the terrible fate he had before alluded to, was, he believed, sent to the prison for being drunk and disorderly. With regard to the punishment of the ring, he understood that it was introduced at the suggestion of the guard Stedman, and that the prisoner who was kept suspended by its means for days had previously had his feet frost-bitten, and was subjected to the most dreadful torture. It seemed to him most horrible that a man should suffer treatment of this kind.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN did not think the prisoners, some of whom had been merely unfortunate enough to get intoxicated, should be treated as demons. He would ask if Coroner Riddell did not write to the Provincial Secretary that no inquest had been held on McKelvey before the report of Mr. Langmuir was drawn up. He regretted that such false reports should have been brought into the House to deceive hon. members. If a Committee of enquiry were appointed, he would be happy to give all information in his power. He regretted to see the attempt to throw discredit upon the brave British officers who had testified to the character of the man Beaumont. There was, however, other evidence to substantiate the testimony