

read them myself, after my hon. friend calling my attention to it, though I did not know that it was intended as a formal notice and after I had spoken to the Minister of Justice, I must say I could not bring my mind to any other conclusion than that there was nothing in it that could connect it with my hon. friend. If there was, I should be the first in this House to insist that proper reparation should be made, and proper punishment inflicted on the offender.

HON. MR. MCINNIS—The hon. leader of the House has charged me with exaggeration. Now, while he was speaking I analyzed the number of questions put to the warden, and I find that there were 13 altogether, 4 of which related to myself. The deputy warden was asked 22 questions, 5 of which related directly to myself. Of the 25 questions put to the Steward, 8 were about me. I think I was quite justified in the statement that I made.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That does not prove that every question that was put to the witnesses was about my hon. friend.

HON. MR. POWER—I quite agree with the leader of the House that we are not now investigating the management of the British Columbia Penitentiary. The thing we are called upon to do now is to examine the report of the British Columbia Penitentiary, and read the language of the Inspector as a man of ordinary intelligence—a disinterested man—would read it, and make up our minds as to whether or not the language contained in the report should be regarded as being calculated to lower the hon. gentleman from New Westminster in the estimation of his colleagues in the Senate and of the people throughout the country who happened to read the report, that is supposing the people who read the report believed the statements made by the Inspector. The hon. leader of the House takes the ground that the ordinary reader would not apply the language of the Inspector to the Senator from New Westminster. We have to look at Mr. Moylan's language and judge of its meaning for ourselves. I may in that connection call attention to the fact that the *Mail* newspaper, which is conducted with at least a fair degree of intelligence I should say, took the remarks of the Inspector as applying to the hon.

gentleman from New Westminster. The hon. gentleman from Delanau diere read the language in the same way. Other members of this House have read the language and understood it in the same sense; so, whatever Mr. Moylan's meaning may have been, it is clear that his language was at least obscure; and an officer of the Government should write more intelligibly and not write in such a way as to be liable to be misunderstood. It is not because Mr. Moylan is not familiar with the English language, and skilful in its use; in fact one difficulty with Mr. Moylan appears to be that he is afflicted with a fatal facility in writing. The hon. leader of the House has adverted, not to the temper shewn by the hon. gentleman from New Westminster, but to his tendency to use somewhat strong language. That is just one of the objections to a report of this kind, that any member who thinks its language applies to himself, necessarily and naturally allows his temper to rise; and when he loses his temper, his language is not characterized by that moderation which generally characterizes speeches in this House, when members are in a state of perfect equanimity, as they should always try to be. At page 25 of the report, we find, after a statement with respect to those convicts who had come over and scattered libellous leaflets on the sacred soil of British Columbia the following:

"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."

And then the Inspector goes on to stigmatize that conduct as dastardly. Then, apparently in order to protect himself in case the matter came up in this House or some similar place, or was brought before the Government in any way, the Inspector says:—

"This is a general proposition without any particular application."

HON. MR. ABBOTT—He stigmatizes the manner as "dastardly"—that could not apply to my hon. friend.

HON. MR. POWER—He says "he is a veritable coward that makes accusations against men who, by reason of their position, are helpless to defend themselves." Did that apply to the publishers of the *British Columbian* newspaper or to the Senator from British Columbia? Any one