

the Government to produce that evidence—I defy them to state that that evidence was taken in writing. Mr. Laviolette may have been questioned, but his evidence was not in writing, though the Minister of Justice states that it was taken by the stenographers. The stenographers were not there, either on the 10th or the 11th, so the statement is false. When I asked by which of the stenographers the evidence was taken, I was told “by Mr. Bourbonnais.” Now, he was not there: he was in the prison, but did not go to the Warden’s house, so that he did not take that evidence. I could mention other things, but will refrain from doing so now, but if I am forced to it I will state the whole thing: there has been underhand work—bad work done in the dark—and the Government know that I am aware of it. They know that I am aware of the fact that they had to travel during the night to do that work. That is why we cannot have an enquiry to get at the facts. I see here in the *Debates* of last year that I stated that the Minister of Justice had foresworn himself. The hon. leader of the House turned to me and asked: “Does the hon. member know that the Minister of Justice is under an oath?” I said: “I do not know whether he is or not, but I repeat, the statement of the Minister is wrong, and consequently he has foresworn himself.” I am ready to prove, if an investigation is granted, that the Ministers were trying to hide bad work that they had done. The oath of a Cabinet Minister is as follows:—

“THE OATH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
PRIVY COUNCIL.

“You, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly promise and swear that you will serve Her Majesty truly and faithfully in the place of Her Council in this Her Majesty’s Dominion of Canada, you will keep close and secretly such matters as shall be treated, debated and resolved on in Privy Council, without publishing or disclosing the same or any part thereof, by word, writing, or otherwise, to any person out of the same Council, but to such only as be of the Council, and yet if any matter so propounded, treated and debated in any such Privy Council, shall touch any particular person, sworn of the same Council, upon any such matter as shall in any wise concern his loyalty and fidelity to the Queen’s Majesty, you will in no wise open the same to him, but keep it secret as you would from any person, until the Queen’s Majesty’s pleasure be known in that behalf. You will in all things to be moved, treated and debated in any such Privy Council faithfully, honestly and truly declare your mind and opinion to the honor and benefit of the Queen’s Majesty, and the good of her subjects, without partiality or exception of persons, in no wise forbearing so to do from any manner of respect, favour, love, need, displeasure or dread

of any person or persons whatsoever. In general, you will be vigilant, diligent and circumspect in all your doings touching the Queen’s Majesty’s affairs. All which matters and things you will faithfully observe and keep as a good Councillor ought to do, to the utmost of your power, will and discretion—  
So HELP YOU GOD.”

I may say that when I had read this oath I was surprised at the conduct of the Government of the day, and particularly of the Minister of Justice, because their duty is to do justice to the public, and if they fail to do so they foreswear themselves. I make this statement, knowing my responsibility as a member of this House. If I made the statement without knowing that it was correct I would have reason to be ashamed of myself—just as much reason as the Minister of Justice has to be ashamed that he has sat by for months and years with such charges as Mr. Laviolette and I have made against him. The charge made by Warden Laviolette, which I read to this House last year, was terrible, and the charge I have made myself is no better. I cannot understand how men who are under oath can quietly sit by without venturing to meet their accusers and have justice done to all parties interested.

Now, gentlemen, there is evidently in all these things something wrong—even a little more than I have said just now. If we take up the Supplementary Estimates we see there an item of \$250 to pay the Inspector. Last year, by documents from the late Warden, we proved to the Commons and to the Senate that that unfortunate man Lefavre had been dismissed for no reason whatever—that it was the chief officers who had deserted their posts and had thrown the responsibility on Lefavre’s shoulders. Yet, what was the answer of the Minister of Justice in the Commons? He says:

“Suppose this is all true, what can I do? I must either dismiss the two officers who have since been promoted and reinstate him, or pay Lefavre the bonus which he has a right to receive from the Government when he resigns—that is, one month’s salary for every year he was in the service of the Government.”

Could he not have asked for money in the Supplementary Estimates, as he has done this year, to pay Mr. Moylan for services rendered four years ago? Is that justice—admitting the fact that injustice had been done, yet refusing to remedy it? I cannot see any justice in such a course.

HON. MR. SMITH—There is no objection to the motion.