

libelled by the *British Columbian* newspapers has the courts of law to apply to for the defence of his character. The person slandered by a member of this House has no such remedy; so that the language is very much more applicable to the Senator than to the newspaper. I should say that one would naturally, reading the next two or three lines, feel that what came after is connected with what went before. The Inspector says: "In connection with the remarks made by Senator McInnes on the 24th of April last, in the Senate, I addressed, with the approval of the Minister, the following letter to that person." Now, it is not an insult to call a member of this House a person: we are all persons; but it is not language which is generally deemed to be respectful; and the hon. leader of the House had to admit that; so that although the leader of the House stated that the letter itself was perfectly respectful, the language used here as preliminary and introductory to the letter was not respectful, but very much the other way. It seems to me that it was mere burlesque on the part of the Inspector to write a letter to a gentleman who was at that time several thousand miles away, a fact which the Inspector must have known. My hon. friend from New Westminster is not a very small or insignificant man, and Mr. Moylan who went to New Westminster to investigate the charges made by the hon. gentleman, must have known before he was in that town a week, that the hon. gentleman was not there; and consequently I must look upon the writing of that letter as a sham. Perhaps that is not the best word to apply to it; but it was worse than an unmeaning act. He refers to the statement made—by the way it was not made as he states it—by the hon. gentleman from New Westminster, that abuses and irregularities existed in this penitentiary. The statement made by the hon. gentleman, as he has explained, was that it was rumored that irregularities existed.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Great irregularities.

HON. MR. POWER—Reading what I have read just now, I as one—and I think I am fairly disinterested, and certainly not in an excited condition, and never have been in connection with this matter—I should think that Mr. Moylan referred to

the hon. gentleman from New Westminster. Then, one of the accusers being several thousands of miles away, the Inspector being about to hold his court, wrote a letter to the other accusers, the Kennedy Bros., publishers of the *British Columbian* newspaper. In that he said:

"I am further informed that in another issue of your journal the general statement made by Senator McInnes last Session in the Senate, as to the existence of abuses and irregularities in this penitentiary was endorsed."

Now, the hon. leader of the House says that there were very gross and outrageous statements made in the newspaper as compared with the very mild statement made by our colleague. I have read the article given in the newspaper as reproduced, and I do not find that any stronger statement was made by the newspaper than by the Senator. The newspaper says that if half the stories told about the penitentiary are true an investigation is urgently demanded. That is not putting the matter much stronger than it was put here. I do not think that the hon. gentleman from New Westminster, when he said that all the questions related to himself meant exactly that; what I understood him to mean at the time was that every witness was asked questions with respect to himself. I find that such questions were put to the Warden, the Deputy Warden, the Protestant Chaplain, the Steward, Keeper Fitzgerald; and then, as the hon. gentleman has just said, when the Inspector undertook to shorten the enquiry there were no questions about the Senator in the short examinations; but a little further on we find that our colleague comes up again. Questions concerning him were put to the Catholic Chaplain, the Accountant, the Bishop of New Westminster, and the Physician. I do not see any reason why the name of the Senator should have been mentioned at all. The question was whether the facts existed, and I think that it was in exceedingly bad taste at least for the Inspector to refer to statements made here in the Senate, and ask those witnesses whether those statements were true. He might have stated the facts, quoted the allegations if he pleased, and asked if those statements were true.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN.—They were the accused parties.

HON. MR. POWER,—Supposing they were the accused parties, they were asked