

It might be well to divide the proceeds in the same proportion as the cost of maintaining gaols, &c.

Mr. SCOTT said that the Bill referred to sentences involving hard labour imposed by the municipal authorities. He did not know that the municipal authorities had the power to impose such penalties.

Mr. MOWAT said the Municipal Act conferred such power.

Mr. MACDOUGALL regretted the absence from his seat of the hon. member for East Toronto, who held very decided views on this question. He (Mr. Macdougall) doubted if this step in the way of making the law more rigorous in this direction was in accord with public sentiment in regard to the punishment of criminals, though it was likely, from the Attorney-General's experience, that he was well informed on that point.

Mr. MOWAT pointed out that it was not a question of rendering the law more rigorous, but of carrying out provisions which were presumed to exist when the sentences were given.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said it was much more degrading to a man to have him perform penal labour in the full glare of the public, with perhaps a chain and ball to his legs, than to have him perform intramural labour.

Mr. MEREDITH said that people would in the former case be less likely to find their way to gaol.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said that that was on the principle that if men were hanged for sheep-stealing that crime would cease, which experience had shown to be an incorrect one.

Mr. MOWAT, in reply to a question by Mr. Macdougall, said the number of committals for indictable offences during the past year was 2,615, and for unindictable offences 10,866. This was something like the proportion he had mentioned. Referring to a remark by the member for London (Mr. Meredith), he said the only difficulty as to the disposal of the proceeds would be in the cases mentioned by that hon. gentleman, viz., those in which cities or towns and counties were jointly interested in the maintenance of gaols, and that point was one he would consider before the Bill went to Committee.

Mr. BELL said that the city of Toronto had long asked for a measure in the direction of the present Bill. He thought, however, that the Bill included in its provisions some prisoners who should not be included—some who, though they might get committed in a matter which was not under their own control, were otherwise respectable.

The motion was carried and the Bill read the second time.

#### SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Clarke (Wellington) in the chair.

On the item Criminal Justice, \$180,200,

Mr. MEREDITH asked what was the practice of the Hon. Attorney-General in regard to the employment of legal assistants? Did the honourable gentleman employ any of his partners? He did not wish to insinuate there was anything wrong in this respect, but merely to ascertain the practice.

Mr. MOWAT was not aware of one case having occurred which could have suggested the inquiry of the hon. gentleman since he had been Attorney-General. In one case a solicitor in London employed by other parties, without any prior communication with the Government, employed his partner. But no bill had been sent in by their firm for services in this matter. If, however, there had been one sent in, it would not have been a matter in which he (Mr. Mowat) was concerned. For reasons, perhaps more sentimental than anything else, he wished to avoid any appearance of their firm obtaining directly or indirectly any remuneration in connection with the position he held. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MEREDITH asked for a statement in regard to the cost connected with the attendance of witnesses in criminal cases.

Mr. WOOD said a return could be brought down to show the exact cost.

Mr. MOWAT said the payments made to witnesses were regulated by statute. He had not the figures showing the actual sum expended, but the total amount certainly fell below the \$20,000 now asked.

Mr. MEREDITH said he knew that large sums had been paid in certain cases, and he contended that a great deal of care should be exercised in passing such accounts.

Mr. ROSS said in his own county the expenses connected with this service had not come up to what was expected when the Act passed. He believed the practice of paying indigent witnesses had no authority in law.

Mr. MEREDITH suggested that some arrangement should be made by which Crown counsel prosecutions should be conducted by some of the eminent lawyers now in the Cabinet. A sum of \$11,200 was asked for this service, and as at certain seasons Ministers had very little to do, it would be a good thing for the country if the system he had suggested was adopted.

Mr. MOWAT said he hoped there would be some season when Ministers were not fully employed, but they had not yet discovered it.

Mr. MEREDITH—Picnic time. (Laughter.)

Mr. MOWAT—That is a very important time. (Laughter.) There is no work of more importance than that of enlightening the public in regard to important public questions. We have had the system the hon. gentleman suggests under consideration for some time already. We even entertained such a view when we had only five Ministers in the Cabinet; and when a sixth member was added we had it again under discussion, and determined that if possible the course spoken of should be followed. But we cannot tell whether it would be practicable to adopt such a system until we have had a little more experience.

Mr. MERRICK expressed the hope that, as we have a good law library at Osgoode Hall, the yearly appropriations for the judges' library should be discontinued.

Mr. MOWAT said it was in the public interest that the judges should have a library for themselves.

The item was passed.

On item 7, Miscellaneous charges, \$16,000,

Mr. MEREDITH objected to the charge of \$5,000 for Provincial police at Clifton and Fort Erie. This expenditure, he contended, should be borne by the municipalities.

Mr. MOWAT said the outlay was necessary for the protection of strangers visiting Niagara from outrages. He contended that the money could not be better expended.

Mr. BAXTER said since the establishment of this force the peace of this district had been well preserved. The municipal authorities could not be expected to bear the expense of this service.

Mr. LAUDER said this was an unjustifiable expenditure, and expressed himself strongly in favour of the abolition of the grant.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said this was an old question, which had embarrassed other Governments besides this. He was of opinion that a revenue might be obtained from the Falls sufficient to cover this expenditure. The lessees, he suggested, should be compelled to pay a reasonable sum for the right of conducting visitors about the Falls.

Mr. PARDEE said as a matter of fact the revenue from that particular locality very nearly balanced the expenditure.

Mr. CURRIE said neither the people of Welland nor the town of Clinton had asked for the establishment of this force, but the Government had thought such a force was necessary for the well-being of the district. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not speak the sentiments of their friends around Clifton when they advocated the discontinuance of