

to come forward and state whether the allegations were true. I call the attention of the leader of the House to a statement which seems to have escaped his usually keen eye: while he has given the House to understand that it was the charges made by the *British Columbian* newspaper, and not the charges made by the honorable member from New Westminster that were being investigated, we find all through the examination that there is not a word, so far as I can see, except one allusion, said of charges published by the *British Columbian*.

HON. MR. ABBOTT.—While the *British Columbian* newspaper is not mentioned, the bulk of the questions relate to the charges made by the *British Columbian*.

HON. MR. POWER. The question relates to the two charges, which were in fact identical, but they were always fixed on the Senator, not on the newspaper. I do not think that I am given to special pleading; and I think I have looked at this whole matter in a fair and direct manner, and the impression made on my own mind—and I think it is the impression that will be borne to the mind of any unprejudiced person reading this report—is that Inspector Moylan intended his language to apply to the hon. gentleman from British Columbia. Whatever he may say now, that the matter has come up in Parliament, at the time that that report was written, I think it is perfectly clear that he referred to the hon. Senator from British Columbia. As I have said, I think the leader of the House was perfectly right in stating that we are not called upon to investigate the condition of the penitentiary. I hope the institution is everything that it should be; but it is perfectly clear that the language used in the Inspector's report is calculated to lower our colleague from British Columbia in the opinion of this House and of the public, that is, if they look at the whole thing as the Inspector of penitentiaries does. There is this further point: Hon. gentlemen will remember that a great deal of the time of this House was taken up on a previous occasion in dealing with language used by this same Inspector of penitentiaries with regard to another very prominent member of this House. Hon. gentlemen must all see how wise and good a rule it is that members of Parliament shall not be

attacked, at least in official reports, for the way in which they have done what they believe to be their duty by the country on the floor of Parliament; and I think that it is a most unfortunate thing that this Inspector of penitentiaries appears to find it very difficult to write a report during these later years without saying something that, whether he means it or not, will be taken by ordinary people to reflect seriously upon members who have thought it their duty to call attention to what they believe to be irregularities in the penitentiaries of which he is merely supervisor. I could understand, if the Inspector was the man conducting the penitentiaries, that he should be very sensitive on the subject; but his duty is merely to supervise the work; and in a visit made once a year, where he sees the wardens and other principal officers, he would not necessarily know of all the abuses that might take place; and I do not see that he should fancy that the remarks made in this House are intended as reflections upon him.

Perhaps it is well that this subject has been brought before the House, but I think this practice of bringing a matter up as a question of privilege and then allowing it to drop is unsatisfactory; and I hope some steps will be taken to prevent a repetition of statements of this kind being made in the reports of the Inspector. The attention of Parliament has been directed very fully to the matter to-day, and I presume will continue to be so directed; but I think some resolution should be introduced and some decided action taken by the House, to prevent a repetition, not only of the attacks but of the consumption of large portions of valuable time, and a large space in our printed Debates in dealing with the sayings of the Inspector of penitentiaries.

HON. MR. POIRIER—I would like to give the benefit of the doubt to the Inspector of penitentiaries, but before the question was mentioned at all in the newspapers, or before I knew of any feud existing between my hon. friend and Mr. Moylan, I came to the conclusion that this was a deliberate insult towards our hon. colleague. Some of our employees called my attention to the fact that a member of this House had been grossly insulted by Mr. Moylan. I do not say that it was the intention of Mr. Moylan to