

of the Ministers came from Montreal at 10.30, and sat till about four, or half-past four in the afternoon, with an intermission of about an hour for lunch. Then about half-past four they left for Montreal again *en route* for Ottawa, and that was the end of it. They spent about seven or eight hours examining some seventy witnesses, and this is what they called making a searching investigation, such as the Minister had promised from his place in the House of Commons. That alone would be sufficient to prove that the object of the Minister was to deceive, because we have his promise here in black and white, and we have also his letter to me. There were two short-hand writers with the Ministers, Mr. Leslie, of the Department of Justice, and Mr. Bourbonnais, of Montreal. This took place two years ago, and now when we ask for the evidence which was taken we are told that there is none, that Mr. Bourbonnais has not thought fit to furnish a copy of his notes. Now, if it was a matter of private business, what conclusion would we draw from such an answer? That the object of refusing to furnish the evidence was to deceive us, to cover up some discreditable transaction. I have a letter from Mr. Bourbonnais, in reply to one from me, and he says that he has no objection to furnish a copy of his notes, but that he had neglected to do so. That means that there was something wrong. If that was not sufficient to prove the motive for such a course, there is something more. On the evening of the 10th, at seven o'clock, I met Mr. Bourbonnais, and learned from him—and there was a third party present at the time—that it was no enquiry; that two or three questions had been put to the officials as to the character of the discipline in the absence of Mr. Laviolette. That was the searching investigation so solemnly promised. It is not surprising, therefore, that the evidence taken at that enquiry cannot be furnished, because since the Minister has deceived the public and failed to carry out his promise he refuses to furnish the evidence which would convict him of deception. When he wrote me that letter, calling on me suddenly to come up to the penitentiary, he thought that I would not be prepared, and that he would thus catch me off my guard; but the moment I read the letter I saw what the intention was.

A searching investigation had been promised, and this letter intimated to me that the Minister was there on a visit. Then I knew that it was only a sham investigation that was to be held, and I governed myself accordingly. We have been told that Mr. Bourbonnais refused to furnish a copy of his notes. It may be that they did not offer him enough remuneration for his work; Mr. Bourbonnais did not ask for the work; he was asked to go there and report the evidence. Now, have not the Government power to force a stenographer, who has taken notes, to furnish a transcript of them? I am sure they have. If that investigation had been of the searching character that was promised, why did they not force the reporter to supply a long-hand transcript of his notes? Because, as I have explained, no such searching enquiry took place. There was pressure on the Government to have the deputy promoted, and the Government were opposed to him, because he could hardly read or write: the times were hard, and Governments are always afraid at such times, so they had to make the appointment, and one of the Ministers was bound by a promise to have that man promoted. All those facts would have leaked out if the promised investigation had taken place. All this proves the correctness of my statements, but it is not pleasant for Ministers—who have denied certain facts—to furnish evidence that they had been misleading Parliament and the public. I asked some questions yesterday to which the leader of the House replied. The first was as to the number of days that the investigation lasted. To that he answered that the visit occupied two days. I have just shown that it was less than a day and a half. Another question which I asked was, whether Mr. Laviolette was called, and to this the reply was that he was called and gave his evidence. As a matter of fact, he was not called: the Minister went to him, but it amounted to the same thing. Now it is important that the evidence given by Mr. Laviolette should be laid before the public, because we have his letters, which I submitted to the House last year, and which can be found in the *Debates*, showing that he was betrayed by his two chief officers. He states clearly in those letters that his life would not have been endangered and the convict would not have been shot had his two officers done their duty. I defy