

Innes until at the end four or five questions are put as follows :

"Q. Have you seen the statement made by Dr. McInnes, last Session of Parliament, about abuses existing in this penitentiary? A. I have read it.

"Q. What do you think of it? A. I think his statement is false.

"Q. Is not this a rather strong word to use. A. I don't think so; but I think the charge groundless and uncalled for on his part.

"Q. Do you not think he made the statement in good faith and in the public interest? A. I do not.

"Q. Why do you say this? A. I base my opinion upon the fact that Dr. McInnes was annoyed because, after the opening of the penitentiary, he could not have his own way in certain matters. I refer to certain appointments which he wanted to make on the staff and to improvements on the grounds."

HON. MR. POWER—Do not those questions of the Inspector remind one very much of that suggestion "Don't nail his ears to the pump"?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—No.

HON. MR. POWER—Very much I think.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This man is not a lawyer, and he did not ask the questions as I should put them, but surely there is nothing improper when he came there specially to make an investigation in consequence of charges that had been made, to call the attention of the witnesses to those charges and ask them what they thought about them. I see nothing wrong, and I cannot imagine that any person could see anything wrong, unless he felt determined, *a priori*, to find something wrong in what the Government officer did. The next witness examined is the Protestant Chaplain, and three-quarters of his deposition is taken up with enquires about the management of the institution. Then, as in the former cases, his attention is called to the charges made by Dr. McInnes. The Steward is asked about the service generally before he is asked any questions about his uncle, and what he is asked seems to point to this, that Mr. Moylan's desire was to get at the bottom of the charges. He found out from the Steward that, at all events, one of the persons who furnished information to my hon. friend was an ex-guard of the institution, a man who had been dismissed. He went to my hon. friend and carried statements to him which were derogatory to the institution. Then the other witnesses were not examined right along. It would have been very easy for Mr. Moylan to put questions to these witnesses, but he makes the following explanation:—

"In order to shorten the enquiry, to save time and writing, and to examine every officer of the staff, I asked each of the under named the following questions. The answers will be numbered correspondingly, 1, 2 and 3.

Q. 1. How long are you in the service?

2. Do you know of anything wrong in this institution?

3. Do you know of any abuses or irregularities in the administration or on the part of any of its officers?

Those are the questions, and there is nothing about my hon. friend here. If Mr. Moylan wished to drag my hon. friend into every man's evidence he could have put his name into each one of those questions. The great bulk of the enquiry was devoted entirely to investigating the way in which the institution was managed. There was a mere incidental reference to my hon. friend in some of the depositions towards the end, simply calling attention to his charges to ascertain if they knew of any foundation for them. My hon. friend must understand, and I am sure the House understands, that if I could satisfy myself that these expressions of Mr. Moylan's could legitimately be held to apply to any member of this House, he would be visited by the displeasure of the Government in a manner more severe and more serious than on a former occasion. The course that the Government took when my hon. friend from Delanaudiere was assailed by Mr. Moylan is proof that the Government is not disposed to disregard misconduct on the part of its employees, but, on the contrary, is inclined and is determined to punish disrespect to any member of either House—any official disrespect on the part of its employees which can be brought home to them, but I must say that having heard the opinion of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, whom my hon. friend does not hesitate to accuse of lying deliberately to him, I do not think Mr. Moylan's report contains a reflection upon the hon. gentleman from New-Westminster. None of us is predisposed to believe that Mr. Moylan is respectful to everybody, because he was not respectful to my hon. friend from Delanaudiere, but when the Minister of Justice examined the report and was convinced that there was nothing in it that could with propriety connect my hon. friend from New Westminster with the Inspector's remarks, I am satisfied that he spoke with the most perfect candor, and with that clearness of judgment which peculiarly characterizes him. And when I