

held an investigation, all the officers of the prison being examined. There was not the faintest ground disclosed in this examination for charges of irregularities in the management of the prison. "That person" will now have to be heard from."

"This is a pretty plain notice to Senator McInnes, and if the cap fits he can put it on. That person will now have to be heard from," meaning Senator McInnes. This shows that the report of Inspector Moylan is just as I said, and I have no doubt that any hon. gentleman who reads that blue-book will see what the Inspector was aiming at, and I would like to ask the Leader of this House what the Government propose to do in the matter.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—If my hon. friend had put a notice on the paper so that I could have made the necessary enquiries as to the precise charge which he proposed to make against Mr. Moylan, I would have gone into the details, and would be prepared to discuss the question at much more length than I can now do with the matter sprung upon me in this way. The hon. gentleman from New Westminster informed me that he intended to bring the matter before the House, but he did not say when, and did not give me any particulars, and as this was several days ago, I supposed he had given up the idea of moving in it. However, I took the trouble to ask the Minister of Justice, in conversation with him, what the ground of complaint was, and what his reply was as to the nature of this report, and he stated that he had examined the report carefully and was satisfied that there is not a word in it which can properly be attached to Senator McInnes. Mr. Moylan is not speaking of Senator McInnes, according to the view of the Minister of Justice, when he writes what the Hon. Senator has read to the House; he is speaking of different persons whom he does not identify, but it certainly does not appear that he is speaking of the Senator.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.). Of whom is he speaking?

HON. MR. ABBOTT. My hon. friend is asking a question which it is impossible for me to answer. I do not know whom the Inspector of prisons suspects of circulating these slanders. My hon. friend, as the *Mail* expresses it, has put on the cap, but whether it fits him or not I do not know. There is nothing in the language

of the report which attached any blame to Senator McInnes that I can see. I have not examined it very carefully, but the Minister of Justice has, and that is the conclusion he came to, and the cursory examination I have been able to give to the paper satisfies me that it is impossible to assert that Mr. Moylan has said anything in this report disrespectful to the Senator. He commences by saying:

"A fly-sheet, printed in Washington Territory, contains the vilest slanders and most bare-faced falsehoods against the administration of this penitentiary and some of its most deserving officers, was put in circulation in Victoria about twelve months ago. The production was the work of two of the most depraved and hardened criminals that have ever cursed with their presence any penitentiary in the Dominion."

Surely my hon. friend does not mean that he is alluded to as one of these people?

"It was one of them who, coming across from Seattle, distributed in a few hours the untruthful and libelous publication and made his escape to American Territory before his arrest could be effected."

HON. MR. POWER—Who does that allude to?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The Report continues:

"Certain individuals, who were either very credulous or very unfriendly disposed towards the administration of the penitentiary, made grave charges, alleging that serious abuses and irregularities existed. These charges were of the vaguest nature, nothing definite being mentioned, and they were advanced in a manner which everyone who appreciates fair play and manliness, must stigmatize as dastardly."

HON. MR. SCOTT—To whom does that refer?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It does not mention one person; it mentions "persons," in the plural. What right has the hon. gentleman to take to himself the statement that persons have made vague charges against the penitentiary? The hon. gentleman was in his right; there was nothing wrong about his speaking of what he thought was wrong in the management of this penitentiary. It was his duty to do so, and such a statement as appears in this report can have no possible reference to the hon. gentleman. In fact, it would require the strongest possible evidence to warrant any of us in coming to the conclusion that the language used refers to a Senator, who in his place in the House, spoke in general and moderate language of a supposed maladministration of a Government institution. I do not think that my hon. friend has any right to assume that he is one of