

"Q. What do you think of it?"

"A. I think this statement is false.

"Q. Is not this a rather strong word to use?"

"A. I don't think so; but I think the charge groundless and uncalled for on his part."

Then comes another important question—it appeared to be the all important question with the Inspector:—

"Q. Do you not think he made the statement in good faith and in the public interest?"

Here he is questioning the motives of an hon. member of this House about charges which, if true, this witness ought to be punished in the severest way, and if not guilty he ought to be exonerated. That is the reason I spoke last year as I did. I contended that if those charges were groundless these men should be honorably acquitted and exonerated from all blame, and those who made the charges should be punished or laid under censure. The answer was:—

"A. I do not.

"Q. Why do you say this? A. I base my opinion upon the fact that Dr. McInnes was annoyed because, after the opening of the penitentiary, he could not have his own way in certain matters. I refer to certain appointments which he wanted to make on the staff and to improvements on the grounds."

When Mr. Moylan went out there to open the Penitentiary, he brought with him the present Deputy-Warden, who had been a guard before that in the Kingston penitentiary. He took him out there and appointed him chief keeper. That was the position he held until about three or four years ago, when he was made Deputy-Warden. I feel as confident as that I live that I never for a moment mentioned any appointment to the then chief keeper, and if I made any suggestion about laying out the grounds I have not the most remote recollection of it. If I did, so little attention did I pay to it that it has entirely escaped my memory, but I am very sure I would not apply to the chief keeper to take any person on the staff, because he was not in a position to make an appointment. That was exclusively in the hands of the Warden and not of the chief keeper, so that the statement made there by the Deputy-Warden is equally false and silly as that of the Warden. I will now call the attention of the House to the evidence given by my nephew, and you will see right along in the questions how the Inspector wishes to entrap him, and if possible, to find out that I had been interfering with the government or internal

arrangements of the penitentiary. He asks the question:—

"Q. Are you aware that any abuses or irregularities have had existence, or still exist, in the management or among the officers?—A. I know of none.

"Q. Have you stated to anyone that they do exist?—A. I have not.

"Q. Has anyone questioned you to that effect?—A. No."

My nephew states that he does not believe that there are any irregularities or abuses in the institution. I have read a portion of the evidence given by each of these witnesses in that mock investigation to show you the animus of the Inspector—to show you that it was not to correct abuses if they existed in the penitentiary, but to fasten on me what he calls "dastardly and cowardly conduct." I leave it to any hon. gentleman in this House if I could have referred to the rumors in a milder manner than I did? Did I insinuate anything but what I had a perfect right to insinuate, and to bring to the notice of the House? The members of that institution, if they are guiltless, ought to have thanked me for drawing the attention of the Government in the mild way that I did to these rumors in order that there should be an investigation into the management of the institution, and to prove to the public whether there was any foundation for the rumors or not. As I said before the report shows the animus of the whole affair. The inspector had not the manliness to mention my name, but in the very last sentence in the moralising and philosophizing general paragraph in the report, which I submit he or no other official should be allowed to insert in a public document, he tries to shelter himself under a general proposition without any application. I leave it to hon. gentlemen to say whether, taking the investigation as a whole, it does not apply to me as plainly as it was possible for him to state it even in words? Now, why was this done? Why has he made this violent attack upon me and upon the Senate of Canada? It was in consequence of this: In 1887 I called the attention of the House to another violent and cowardly attack upon an hon. member of this House, issued in a Blue Book, without the authority of the Minister of Justice. I will read it, and I shall read the reply of the leader of the Government in this House.