

in the blue book. On Monday last, the 6th instant, the hon. leader of this House, having laid before the Senate a supplementary report from the inspector of penitentiaries, I looked over it and found a good many bad references to myself, but on page 304 I found the most shameful of them all—an attack which is even more offensive to the House than to myself. I was then determined to bring the whole matter before the House as a question of privilege, but having as I generally do in all cases, reflected upon what would be the proper course I considered that I could not do so—that I could not attack the Inspector without attacking also the Minister himself, who is responsible for this book and everything it contains. Having heard so much from Nova Scotians of the honorable character and the straightforwardness of Mr. Thompson, I said to myself “it is impossible that the Minister of Justice has sanctioned this and he must have been, as Sir Alexander Campbell and myself have often been, deceived by the inspector.” I therefore wrote to the Minister of Justice asking him if he would allow me an interview of five minutes. He answered that he would see me with pleasure on Wednesday at 10 o'clock a.m. I went to his office and when I showed him this foot note and asked him if he knew anything of it, his first remark was “It is a disgrace.” He then told me that he knew nothing of it. He added “To prove to you that I could not know anything of it I will show you the letter written by yourself, the only letter which I have taken into consideration. You will see that there is no note there: I would not allow anything of the kind. No man has to make a note on a letter from a member of Parliament to the Minister of Justice.” He sent for the letter and I looked at it and recognized it as my own and there was no note upon it. It appears then that the Inspector, having been ordered to prepare a copy for the bluebook, put this note on the copy sent to the printing office so that the Minister of Justice would not know that it was there until the book was circulated through the Dominion. Those are the facts. I considered then that it would be better for me to wait and not

to bring the question before the House, but allow time to the Minister of Justice to vindicate both parliament and myself. In the meantime I will keep silent. I am well known in this country, especially in my own province. I care very little about these vile attacks. If I was not a member of this House I would not even sneer at them, but as I am, I must follow up this breach of privilege, though personally I would be ready to wait, under the circumstances, until I saw the outcome of the affair. I have some 40 or 50 pages of a statement prepared, which I intended to place before the Senate some of these days, concerning those troubles in the penitentiary. I have accompanied the statement with evidence and documents to sustain my charges, but after the conversation I had with the Minister of Justice I will wait to see whether anything will be done to punish the offence given both to this House and to myself. For four years I have been asking for an enquiry to discover the cause of those troubles which ended in the sudden death of a convict and the serious wounding of the warden and several other officers of the penitentiary, besides the very great expenditure connected with the revolt. I asked over and over again for an enquiry, and one was promised last year, but during the recess I was laughed at. The enquiry was never made, and why? Because the Inspector had continually been at work to show that there was no necessity for it. Even under those circumstances, badly as I was treated and knowing all I know and the mischief which has been done during the last 15 months, I have not said a single word in the way of an attack upon those men during this session. I have preferred to keep silence, knowing that I have done my duty, and leaving with the Government the responsibility of all the evil which has been the consequence of their excessive trust in officials who deceived them, as, they must see now, was the case. If the Inspector perpetrated what it appears he has done, is he a fit man, I ask, for the responsible position he holds? If he did so in this case, how can the Minister rely on him or on his reports to dismiss officials or retain them in office? My warnings were received with contempt. The Minister ought to see now