

der him in an anonymous or dastardly way, but spoke out in his place in the Senate in a proper way, in a manner that his duty justified, and why my hon. friend puts the cap on his own head I cannot understand. Then the Inspector goes on and speaks of this as a general statement, he does not speak of my hon. friend's remarks as a charge. He says:

"Owing to the general statement made in the Senate, last Session, and its endorsement by the "British Columbian" newspaper in the absence of any party or parties to prefer charges against the management and officers of the penitentiary, I consider it advisable and my duty, to examine the officers of the staff, individually, in a general way, on oath, as to the administration of the institution.

And then he went into the investigation. Among the witnesses examined was a near relative of my hon. friend, and the inspector gives the whole of the evidence which he took in this report. With the exception of one thing, which I think was improper, in this report—he used the word "person" speaking of my hon. friend—I see nothing in the world that he could object to, and nothing in the world to fasten upon him this statement which Mr. Moylan made as to his opinion of persons who slandered their neighbors and circulated falsehoods in a deliberate manner behind their backs. That was the conclusion that the Minister came to, and the conclusion which seemed to be justified by a closer examination that I made myself of the report; and in the absence of its being shown that these persons who are alluded to by Mr. Moylan included my hon. friend, I do not see, nor does the Minister see, what step he can take about the matter. I can only say, in answer to my hon. friend's question, that being satisfied that the remarks in this report did not apply to Senator McInnes, there being nothing in the report itself which creates any connection between them and the hon. gentleman, the Government can do nothing in the matter whatever.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—The question is put—why is this remark supposed to apply to Senator McInnes? It is because it appears distinctly so in black and white, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he had to deal with this case as he deals with many other cases, he would admit that the language in the report applies to the hon. gentleman from New Westminster. On this same page the statement

is made that those who make charges are cowards, and then he adds that he wrote to "that person"—to whom does the inspector refer when he speaks of "that person?" The report is there, and I defy any one to say conscientiously that he has any doubt that the hon. gentleman from New Westminster is intended. If we take any pride in being Senators, it is on condition that the Senate be respected by the Government, and if the Minister of Justice has stated that he read this report (as I have no doubt he did) knowing him to be a good scholar, I am surprised that he should state that in his opinion the language does not apply to a member of this House. When Mr. Moylan made an attack on a member of this House two years ago, it was not considered a matter of importance, because the object of his attack was opposed to the Government; to-day another member opposed to the Government is attacked. The Government may think they should do nothing to punish the Inspector for attacking their opponents, but friends of the Government may be attacked at any time in a similar manner, and they should clearly express their opinion as to whether they desire this thing to continue. Now, what did Senator McInnes say last year? He complained of irregularities, and said that if they were not remedied it would be his bounden duty to demand an investigation, not by the Inspector—and why? Because, as I have shown this House, there is strong evidence that the Inspector is not worthy the confidence of any honest Government. Have I not charged him, as well as the Government, with having made a false report to Parliament? I said so on a former occasion; I repeat it now, and for fear that an investigation might be held, the Government have remained twelve months under the charge of having made a false report. When I made the statement, I asked for an investigation, and was told that I could not have it. I proposed to the Government to take seven of their friends, and amongst them I mentioned the hon. Mr. Macdonald, of British Columbia, the hon. Mr. Dickey, of Nova Scotia, and five other of their supporters. I said: "let there be a committee and to-morrow I will submit my evidence." That was refused on the ground that I had not given a day's notice. If notice was required, I was the one which should have expected it, in order to