

Ques. 692. Was the course thus adopted, strictly followed by the Commissioners?—Ans. I have reason to believe that this course was strictly followed.

Ques. 693. Did the Commissioners hold preliminary conversations with a number of gentlemen residing in Kingston, including several former Inspectors of the Penitentiary, in regard to the alleged abuses in the Institution?—Ans. They did so.

Ques. 694. Did the Commissioners, on the information of these gentlemen, and the written documents placed in their hands by Government, proceed to examine under oath such parties as they were led to believe cognizant, from personal knowledge of the actual condition of the Penitentiary?—Ans. It was mainly on such information and such documents. I cannot say whether or no the prosecution of the Commissioners' enquiries may have been based upon other information.

Ques. 695. Did the Commissioners extract from the evidence of the parties so examined, such portions as seemed to affect the character or conduct of any officer, and serve a written copy thereof upon him for explanation?—Ans. I believe it was so.

Ques. 696. Were these extracts of evidence carefully considered by the Commissioners, and minute instructions given to the Secretary as to the portions of testimony to be extracted, or was the selection left to the Secretary's discretion?—Ans. The extracts may have been carefully considered by the Commissioners; but my impression is, that the instructions were general, that the Secretary should inform the several parties with the nature of such charge, and that the Commissioners returned home, while the Secretary prepared such charges.

Ques. 697. Were such extracts transmitted to Mr. Henry Smith, Warden, Dr. Sampson, physician, and Mr. Francis W. Smith, kitchen keeper, and on his demanding it, were copies of statements in which his name incidentally occurred furnished to Mr. Hopkirk, one of the Inspectors?—Ans. I have always understood that such was the case.

Ques. 698. Was it arranged between the Commissioners and the Warden before he commenced his defence, that "the Secretary should read out the answer to each question as he had written it, and not proceed until the witness and the Warden were satisfied that the answer was correctly taken down;" state also if the practice was not strictly in accordance to this rule?—Ans. I believe that this was so.

Ques. 699. Was this practice strictly followed throughout the investigation?—Ans. I think it was.

Ques. 700. Was each question, when put to the witness, if not objected to by a Commissioner, held to be put with the consent of the whole Board?—Ans. Certainly.

Ques. 701. Did Mr. Smith or his clerk, keep a record of the whole evidence, and did they compare his record with the answers read aloud by Mr. Brown, and make suggestions in amendment from time to time?—Ans. I have no recollection on the subject; but there can be no doubt that the evidence being read aloud, the clerk or Warden would so compare it, and would offer amendments when considered necessary.

Ques. 702. Was there ever a suggestion made by any witness in amendment of his testimony, that was not made in the record by Mr. Brown, or one suggestion made by any Commissioner, or Mr. Smith, that was not referred to the witness, and if sustained by him, at once carried out?—Ans. I do not recollect any refusal to make necessary alterations, nor do I think it probable that reasonable requests would be refused.

Ques. 703. Was there ever any unwillingness shewn by Mr. Brown to correct the evidence of any witness, or any disposition shewn by him, to give the testimony other than its true coloring?—Ans. I think the examinations were con-