

nours, during the Term, and that the reason of this practice was that the Court of King's Bench in Criminal Term, is a Court of Gaol delivery, but that in cases of minor misdemeanours, where the Defendants were at large on Bail, the Indictments were laid by the Clerks of the Peace before the Quarter Sessions; my answer to that question was not minuted. Mr. Lafontaine said that he thought it not material. I did not request that it should be noted, as I would have done, had it occurred to me at the time, that it was material. Having afterwards mentioned that circumstance as not supposing there was any thing private in it, and as freely as I should have mentioned any occurrence in the Court of King's Bench or Quarter Sessions, the Attorney General asked me, some days afterwards, whether I should have any objections to embody those statements in an Affidavit. I answered that I should not, and I reduced them to writing for him. He had my draft copied and added all the innuendos which were in the Affidavit when handed to me from him. From that time to this, I have not on any occasion, either by reference to manuscript or by conversation, or by reading the printed Affidavit, in any way whatever, refreshed my memory upon the subject. Mr. Perrault, one of the Clerks of the Peace, told me that he had been examined before the said Committee on the same subject. This is as much as I recollect of the matter; I had not at the time of the occurrence any reason to suppose I should have occasion to refer from memory to the subject.

When your examination was ended, how many persons were present, and who were they before whom your Evidence was read?—I do not recollect there was any thing minuted on that last occasion; the first time there were several Members present, but on the second occasion, Dr. Labrie had left the room, Mr. Lafontaine and myself remained alone, and I do not recollect that other Members entered. I do not recollect having been examined since. Nothing could have been read to me the second time, since nothing was written.

You said that you were twice examined before the same Committee, what length of time or how many days elapsed in the interim?—I think there was an interval of several days.

Was any of the Evidence which you gave before the Committee read to you, after it had been taken down in writing?—Either my deposition was read to me as it stands, or question by question; there were several Gentlemen present, but I do not recollect whether there was a Quorum or not. I believe there were five Members present. After the deposition then made before the Committee was read over to me and approved, I was examined after a few days interval, and what I have stated respecting a further examination, is the matter already stated by me in my answer of this day to the fifth question.

When the Petitioner questioned you as you have stated above, did he not merely read to you the questions which he had written from the dictation of Doctor Labrie himself, a Member of the Committee?—I paid so little attention to the mode of questioning, that I do not recollect whether the questions were put in writing or verbally, nor with respect to my first deposition neither.

You said that Mr. Labrie at one time requested the Petitioner to take down your Evidence, had Mr. Labrie himself begun to write down your Evidence, and was it then that you had given the answer mentioned in the reply to the fifth question?—I do not recollect that Doctor Labrie put me any question. When I entered, I think, Doctor Labrie was occupied in writing until he went away, and it is on that day that I made the answer, mentioned in my answer to the fifth question.