

a Royal Commission, that he gets some remuneration for his services in that capacity, and in this case he received \$250, which was one-half the amount paid to his fellow commissioner.

INSPECTOR MOYLAN'S EXPENSES.

MOTION.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved :

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General ; praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a statement showing the expenses incurred by the Inspector of Penitentiaries in his visits, ordinary or extraordinary, to St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary during the last ten years, as well his personal expenses for each day of such visits, as those occasioned on each day of such visits by his travelling from Montreal to St. Vincent de Paul, and *vice versa*, for horses, servants, and their keep and lodging.

He said : This motion may seem out of place as dealing with such trivial matters, but when I see that this officer has since Confederation received from the Government all kinds of remuneration, and his expenses are very high, I cannot help feeling that it is my duty to ask for this information. There is another officer in the Department here, Architect Bowes, a very old gentleman, who goes once a month to St. Vincent de Paul. He stays there usually two nights, and while there takes his board in the little town, and incurs very little expense ; but Mr. Moylan does not consider expense at all. He generally takes seven or eight days on one of those trips. He reaches Montreal about noon, telegraphs to the penitentiary for a team, eleven miles, and has a splendid span of horses that had been bought for Lieutenant-Governor Masson, sent in for him. He is driven out to St. Vincent de Paul, the toils being paid both ways, does a few hours work, and is driven back to Montreal, the carriage being driven by an officer of the penitentiary. He stays in Montreal all night, the expenses of the horses, and servant, and himself being paid at the St. Lawrence Hall. In the morning he is driven out to St. Vincent de Paul, where he arrives at about 10:30 a.m. He holds a sitting until noon, takes lunch, resumes work, and then at about 3:30 p.m. he is again driven to Montreal. So it goes on day by day, and the expenses so incurred seem to me to be very great for the work done. I would not have brought up this question, as I felt it was a trifling affair for the Dominion ; but I

see that four years after the enquiry of 1886—after he had been admonished for the uncivil words he used in two of his annual reports, by being deprived of \$400 increase in his salary, he gets from the Government two grants of \$250 each. If the Inspector deserved \$250 for work done four years ago why did he not get it in 1886, when Mr. Baillairgé, his colleague on the Commission, got his money ? Is it not plain that it is to make good the loss which he sustained by being deprived of an increase in his salary on account of the uncivil words used in his official report of two years ago ? I cannot help bringing this matter before the attention of the House, and if there are any independent members in this Parliament they must see that they are laughed at by Mr. Moylan and the Government. The Government punishes with one hand, and then they give this man money by a side way, so that far from commending the Government for having punished Mr. Moylan two years ago, I would much rather have heard these gentlemen state that they were satisfied with Mr. Moylan, and that I was wrong in bringing the matter before the notice of the House. Another reason is this : I have in my hand a document which is not before the House, but which I found in the Department of Justice. It has a few words showing the hatred of the Inspector towards Warden Laviolette before he got shot. A few years before, when on a visit to the penitentiary, Inspector Moylan wrote in the registry kept there : "Mr. Laviolette is ordered to expend a little less on coal oil." Is not that a shame ? That is in black and white in the registry. When I see such conduct, on the part of that officer, approved, and supported and when he is encouraged, I may say, to attack every hon. gentleman in this House who dares to rise and criticize the management of the penitentiaries, it is time we should say that there is something wrong. Another evidence of this is the fact that no this enquiry there were two gentlemen. Mr. Baillairgé is quite as honorable a man as Mr. Moylan, and I have no doubt that every gentleman in this House who knows both men will say that if Mr. Moylan is a respectable man Mr. Baillairgé is a very respectable man. Mr. Baillairgé was appointed with Mr. Moylan on that Commission in 1886. They both arrived at St. Vincent de Paul in May, 1886, and the