

was aware that nothing that was done upon the floor of the House was unknown to the prisoners for more than forty-eight hours after its occurrence. It was necessary to enforce the strictest discipline in the institution, as they had some of the worst characters in Christendom there. If such things had occurred as his hon. friend from Ottawa had referred to, they were certainly acts of great cruelty, and if he were furnished with the names he would have the matter investigated, and those guilty of such offences would receive the punishment they deserved. But his hon. friend was quite mistaken as to the powers of the Warden. The by-laws regulating punishment in the Central Prison had been approved of by the Governor in Council, and they provided for the particular kind of offence for which the lash should be applied. The duty of the Warden was to report all the circumstances of extreme cases to the Inspector of Prisons, and if that official considered the offence such as to merit punishment by the lash, he gave instructions that such punishment should take place. Previous to the punishment the surgeon of the gaol had to certify to the bodily fitness of the prisoner to undergo the infliction, and when it did take place the surgeon had to be present. They had thus surrounded the prisoner with all the safeguards which justice required, or which any hon. member could ask for. He might state that the number of the prisoners flogged in the institution since January 1878 was only ten. It was very strange that while Sunday after Sunday young men from the Protestant Associations and priests of the Catholic Church visited the Central Prison, and were in constant communication with the prisoners, nothing of the kind had been brought to their notice. He had a letter from one whom the hon. members from East Peterboro' and Ottawa would admit was good authority. The letter, which was addressed to himself, was as follows:—

ARCHBISHOPRIC OF TORONTO,
Toronto, August 4, 1878.

Hon. S. C. Wood, Treasurer:—

HON. AND DEAR SIR,—I am very thankful to you and Mr. Langmuir for your kind attention to the wants of the Catholic prisoners. They are now supplied with bibles, prayer books, and catechisms of their own religion, and are on the fair way to be much benefitted by their stay in the Central Prison. Before receiving those books they felt that the Protestant prisoners had more advantages than they had. The officials also appear to me to act fairly and kindly with all the prisoners. I have visited the prison frequently for the last two years or so, and confirmed and heard the confessions of many of the men, and I have reason to know that the Central Prison has done a large amount of good for all its inmates. There is a good spirit of industry which tends to reform. In fact, many have told me that they were glad they were arrested to stop their crimes and give them time to think of themselves. The young men especially speak in this manner.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,
Archbishop of Toronto.

Mr. ROBINSON said that in some cases the most rigorous forms of punishment failed to make a prisoner obey the rules of the gaol. He thought that in the end this would turn out to be an unfounded charge.

Mr. LAUDER, alluding to the remark of the Provincial Treasurer that the prisoners would know within forty-eight hours what the House had been saying on this question, did not see how this could be. He thought perhaps it was a subject worthy of investigation.

Mr. WOOD said the discipline in the Central Prison was as strict as that of any prison in the United States as regards prisoners being allowed to talk among themselves or to people from outside. He desired to say, however, that the complaints made and the discussions which took place upon the floor of the House were largely instrumental in frustrating the good the Government were trying to do through the prison. He moved that the resolution should be amended by the addition of the words—

And that a copy of the by-laws and Orders in Council upon cases in which flogging is to be administered also be brought down.

Mr. CURRIE read from a report of the Inspector of Asylums and Prisons to the effect that a number of the prisoners had been asked to state their grievances, if they had any, with regard to their treatment. Some complained of the cooking, and some of the food; but further investigation showed that the only real complaint was that on some occasions the potatoes had not been properly boiled.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said that notwith-

standing the letter of his Grace the Archbishop, who he doubted not believed what he had written, there were some things going on in the Central Prison which neither the Archbishop nor the Treasurer were aware of. He believed he could prove that cases of flogging had occurred in the prison under the order of the Warden. His object was not to blame the Government, but to show the House and the country that there was something wrong in the discipline of the prison.

Mr. MERRICK said it seemed strange the hon. member did not move for a Special Committee. He was glad the Treasurer had offered the explanations he did concerning the discipline of the prison, and he approved the system of having flogging done only at the instance of the Inspector.

Mr. BAXTER said the Government should not interfere with the discipline of the Central Prison. The charge was that a prisoner had been flogged, probably he deserved it. (Hear, hear.) The lash was the only means of keeping some of the prisoners in order. The Government's duty was to see that the prisoners were properly cared for and properly punished too. The charge would probably be found to be a most trivial one, for he thought the Warden was a really good officer.

Mr. SCOTT said the hon. member for Ottawa proposed that this return should be brought down with the view to moving or a Committee of Investigation afterwards. The hon. member claimed that he had knowledge of the facts of which he spoke, and if so his course was surely to move for a Committee.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE—I intend to do so.

Mr. SCOTT continued that the return could not give any information useful in this case, for it would not show whether the flogging in any case was deserved or not. He would be sorry to have the discussion upon this question continued. If he had been a supporter of the Government, as was the hon. member for Ottawa, he would have gone to the Provincial Treasurer and spoken of the matter to him, and if there was an explanation it would have been given quietly and this painful discussion avoided. If the charge were acknowledged the Committee could be moved for, and the matter brought before the House in a fair and straightforward manner. The hon. member for Peterboro', when he had a somewhat similar charge to make, had taken this course, and the investigation had taken place in a regular form.

The motion was carried as amended.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) moved for a second reading of the Bill to amend the Municipal Act. He said that township halls were usually erected in the centre of the township in some small village. When these became incorporated towns the property passed into their hands. It was necessary to hold nominations in the Township Hall, and the present Bill provided for the holding of these nominations in the Town Hall.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the Special Committee upon amendments to the Municipal Act.

Mr. McCRAVEY, in moving the second reading of an Act to amend the Municipal Act, said the amendment was asked to enable all municipalities to grant aid to docks and harbours. In the county he represented there were several cases in which it was desired to grant aid to such projects.

Mr. CREIGHTON approved the Bill, instancing a case in which the town of Owen Sound had been prevented from giving a bonus to such an enterprise.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the same Committee.

Mr. MILLER said that there having been so many Bills proposed to amend the Municipal Act he would not introduce his amendment except as a recommendation to the Special Committee. In new districts, where there was a great deal of woods or open country, it was desirable that cattle should be allowed to run at large. Though there was nothing in the Act specially against this, yet the party whose property was injured by such cattle could recover damages though he had taken no care whatever to keep out the cattle by keeping his fences in order. He would move for this to be added when the general Act