

press, to associate a gentleman's name with that of another who may have done wrong, simply because he happens to be a connection by marriage or by blood. I do not know of any meaner mode of attack. Still, I question very much whether it becomes a question of privilege that should be brought up in this House. I have the report before me, and the House will see that the reference to the hon. gentleman was altogether unnecessary. The inspector says in his report:—"The subsequent career of many of these witnesses, notably of the accountant and storekeeper"; and then he puts in parenthesis, "nephew of Senator McInnes, of B. C."

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—That is the third offence of the same kind.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Now that the hon. gentleman has called attention to it, I remember that Mr. Moylan was taken to task for a similar offence before, but I can only say, so far as the Minister of Justice is concerned that he was not aware that it was published until his attention was called to it by the questions on the paper. How far the hon. gentleman's suggestion, in reference to dealing with Mr. Moylan's superannuation could be acted upon is a question that I shall have to leave to the lawyers to decide. My own impression is that he is as independent of the government to-day as the hon. gentleman is himself. We have no control whatever over him, and he has the same right that every other citizen has to write articles in the newspapers, if they think proper to publish them, and he must be held individually responsible, whether in courts of law or otherwise, for his conduct. I deeply regret, as a member of the government, and I desire to express equally the regret of the Minister of Justice, that a report coming from any department of the government should, even inferentially, attack any hon. gentleman. I do not know that the remark made by Mr. Moylan in that letter that has been read would be considered a slander. He says that the hon. gentleman from British Columbia is "polished and amiable." If he had added "handsome" he would not have said anything in excess. If ridicule would justify the bringing of such matters before this House, I think I might mention quite a number of newspapers in which I have been ridiculed in a way that has amus-

ed me and my friends, and disgusted some of my family, who think that it should not be allowed.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Not by pensioners of the government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—We have nothing to do with the pensioners of the government.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—Withhold their pensions.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There is no law which would justify the government in doing so. If you think the offence is so grave as to justify that, it is a matter which we can consider in the future.

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

INQUIRIES.

Hon. Mr. McINNES inquired:—

Is it the intention of the Government to reappoint Arthur McBride, late warden, and William Keary, late accountant, to the wardenship and accountantship, respectively, of the New Westminster Penitentiary? If not, why not?

He said: The reason why I ask the last question "If not, why not?" is this—it was proven during the investigation that both the warden and the accountant were merely carrying out the instructions given them by the deputy warden and the inspector of penitentiaries—that the warden was a mere figurehead—placed in that unfortunate position by the inspector, and had to carry out the instructions given him by the deputy. Of the three men, the guilty person was reappointed, while the comparatively innocent men were not reinstated.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is not the intention of the Government to reappoint Arthur McBride, late warden, and William Keary, late accountant, to the wardenship and accountantship, respectively, of the New Westminster Penitentiary. Reason, on account of their unsatisfactory records while holding such positions. If the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that the warden was a mere figurehead and only carried out the orders of a subordinate, is true, it is the very best reason why he should not be reappointed.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B. C.) inquired:

1. Was it on the recommendation of a member of the Dominion Parliament from British Columbia,