

It will be found in the Senate Debates for 1887, at page 284:—

“We have a penitentiary within a mile of where I live in New Westminster. It is believed that there are a great many irregularities in connection with the management of that institution. I am not going to make any charges now, but I believe the rumors are well founded, and when the proper time comes, I fear it will be my bounden duty to ask that an investigation be made, and that it be placed entirely beyond the control or influence of the Inspector of Penitentiaries, and the Government, and that some judge of the Supreme Court, or other thoroughly disinterested and qualified person shall take evidence and investigate all complaints, and thereby do justice to the people of the penitentiary, and if they are not guilty of what they are charged they will be exonerated; if guilty they should be punished, and the public will be satisfied. Anything short of that, in my opinion, will not give satisfaction.”

The reply of the hon. leader of this House was satisfactory and I give him credit upon that occasion. He did his duty well, honestly and faithfully. No person could have done more than he did on that occasion to vindicate the honor and the dignity of the House, and the Inspector received a reprimand. I do not think it is any secret when I say that another mode was taken to mark the sense of the Government, and that was, I believe, by knocking off some \$500, that was about to be added to his salary. I heard it so stated and I believe it is correct. It appears that that is the foundation for all his vile report and references to me, and this mock investigation that was held at the penitentiary. Under all the circumstances, every step which this man has taken, every question that he has asked, every word that he has uttered in connection with this mock investigation shows the animus of the individual. It shows conclusively that his object was not to do justice to the institution and those officials employed in it, but to have a slap at me, to defame me if possible and in doing that, I submit, it was carrying out the instincts—yes the instincts of a lineal descendant and faithful disciple of Judas Iscariot, because only a Judas Iscariot could act in such a vile, contemptible manner, and I sincerely hope that the Government will not keep the lubberly, impudent parasite in their employ any longer. Is he retained there to vilify members of this House, or is he there to discharge a public duty? I made no insinuation against him in my remarks when I brought the matter before the House, and if the House is true to itself it must vindicate its own honor. The Senate has sunk low enough in the opinion of the country—so low that a

hired servant of the Government, in a report in a public document, with perfect impunity, imputes most improper motives to a member of this House when he rises in his place and discharges what he believes to be a public duty. I say that it is time that the Senate should mark its sense of wrongdoing in allowing Government officials to slander public men.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I really must express my regret that I am compelled to address the House again on this subject. If my hon. friend had followed the hon. gentleman from Laval I would have answered the two questions at once.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman from New Westminster rose in his place before the leader of the House stood up.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I did not see anyone rise; if I had I should certainly have waited until I heard what my hon. friend had to say. However, as the hon. gentleman has spoken, I think I must say a few words in answer to him, because I really do not think that the aspersions which he is casting on Inspector Moylan are justified by what I find in this report. I have nothing to do with Mr. Moylan himself or his disposition towards the hon. gentleman. What I have to do, as a member of the Government, is to see, as far as I can form an opinion, whether an officer of the Government has in any respect vilified or insulted, or spoken disrespectfully, or improperly, of any member of this House. That is the task I propose to set myself in connection with this enquiry, and beyond that I do not propose to go, whether the enquiry was a valid enquiry or substantial enquiry, except in so far as it bears on my hon. friend's complaint; but I must say this—and my hon. friend will pardon me for saying it—I have listened attentively to what he said with the expressed intention of proving that the remarks of Mr. Moylan were intended to apply to him and no one else, and the more he has said, and the more I compare what he has said with what I see before me in this report, the more I am convinced that he is entirely in error, and that there is nothing in this report to connect him with the remarks of Mr. Moylan which he finds offensive. He has given us two or three reasons why he thinks Mr. Moylan refers