

obnoxious passages in that report and sent it to my hon. friend, so that he had from Monday last to the present time to investigate and thoroughly sift the question before it came up to-day, and I must confess that I cannot understand the hon. gentleman when he says that this matter has been sprung on him. My object in going to see Sir John Thompson was not only to give him time to make reparation, if reparation were possible, but to ask him if he was aware of this—if he had seen and read this before it was printed. I told him, in submitting the matter to him, that I did not believe—I could not believe that he was a party to it, or that he had any knowledge of what was being placed in the report. To my utter astonishment he told me, after some hesitation, that he was aware of it. Notwithstanding that statement of the Minister of Justice, I have no hesitation in saying that I did not believe that statement of his (cries of Oh! Oh!) I have more charity, more consideration for him and for the high and honorable position he occupies, than to believe that he read that report before it was put in the hands of the printer. I believe his kindness of heart and anxiety to shelter his official, caused him to state that he saw it before it went to press. That is the impression that was made on me at the time, and I hold that impression yet, for were Sir John Thompson guilty of being a party to the libellous, the scandalous and, I might say, indecent report, made by the Inspector of Penitentiaries, he would be unworthy of keeping the position that he now holds. I will now show the leader of this House, and every member of the Senate, that no two constructions can be placed on that report, and that it refers to me and to me alone; and it is only by an enormous stretch of the imagination and by a complete perversion of facts, that one can avoid that conclusion. The hon. gentleman has read that particular portion of the report referring to those ex-convicts that came over from Seattle and issued a number of fly sheets containing the most libellous statements and slanders, as he says, on the officers of the British Columbia Penitentiary. There was nothing indefinite about this statement. The charges made in that fly sheet were of the most violent character, and that fly sheet only represented what was current for years before it made its appearance in that

form. It will be observed here in all the passages and letters quoted by the Leader of the Government, that he omits the connection with myself, and I intend to fill up that gap which will, as I said before, show you conclusively that the language used was meant for me and no other person. Immediately after characterizing the person who would not formulate his charges as a dastardly coward, and abusing him in the strongest adjectives he could command, he connects my name with this proposed investigation and says that he addressed a letter to "that person." Now, the hon. Leader of the House has read that letter to you. It is dated New Westminster, 5th September, 1889, and was written about one week after the arrival of the Inspector. The city of New Westminster has a population of about 8,000, and every official in connection with the penitentiary was aware that I was about 8,000 miles away from home at the time this official, who was about to exercise judicial functions and investigate the irregularities at the penitentiary, addressed a letter to me. Instead of myself acting in a cowardly manner, he showed himself an arrant coward—he took advantage of my absence with my family, when I was travelling in Europe, 8,000 miles away from New Westminster, to ask me to formulate my charges and substantiate what I had said in my place in the Senate. And in order to shield himself again he says "I received no reply, the Senator as I learned being absent." He does not say that he learned of it at the time, though he must have been aware of it. But this is only in keeping with the complete farce of the whole investigation that was held at New Westminster. Then again he wrote a letter asking the editors of the British Columbia newspaper to appear and make good the charges they had published four months before I ever spoke in this Senate about irregularities in the penitentiary. I may say here that for years I had been receiving letters, and dozens of respectable men had told me of the irregularities, not irregularities, but abuses of the worst and grossest kind in the penitentiary, but my lips were sealed by the fact that I had never had an unpleasant word with Mr. Moylan, the warden, the deputy warden or any official in connection with the institution, and the only thing I reproach myself for now is that I so long kept quiet, and