

just moved in this matter. I had no idea that he was going to put a notice on the paper calling upon the Inspector to appear at the Bar of the House. This was done on his own responsibility; I never was consulted in the matter. I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that Mr. Moylan is only an official of the Government, and, as far as his apology is concerned it is all right. No hon. gentlemen could expect anything else, than to make such an apology as he has made to the leader of the Senate, but that report of his was submitted to his chief, and the Minister of Justice fathers it. I do not think that it would be derogatory to the high standing of the Minister of Justice to send a letter to the Senate disclaiming any intention of insulting any member of the Senate or the Senators as a whole. He owes it to himself and to the leader of this House, and he owes it to this House more particularly after the unanimous expression of opinion here by every hon. gentleman who spoke some four or five days ago on this subject. Had there been a division of opinion, it would be a little different, but the construction that the *Mail* and other newspapers placed on the report confirmed the construction put upon it by the hon. gentleman from DeLaudière, the hon. gentleman from Halifax, a countryman and co-religionist and who has been on the most friendly terms for a great number of years with the offender, (and all those things had to be overcome) the hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Scott) and the hon. gentleman from Mille Isles, every hon. gentleman that spoke here confirmed the impression that was made on me, that the Inspector intended to make a gross attack on me as an individual, and on the Senate as a whole. There was only one opinion, notwithstanding the extraordinary efforts put forth by our leader to put a different construction upon it. In view of all that, it is but fair and just to the Minister himself, to the hon. gentleman who leads this House and to the Senate, that the Minister of Justice should make some reparation for what has gone abroad in the report, under his sanction. I said the other day, I believe he never read it and never meant that such a construction should be placed upon it. It should be remembered that this is not the first or the second time that this same official has been guilty of such conduct.

In view of the fact that he is a well educated man, an old journalist who knows precisely the meaning of what he writes, I think it is only fair and just to all parties that some acknowledgement should be made by the Minister of Justice that he never intended, in the report issued by his authority, that there should be any reflection on this House or on any of its members.

HON. MR. MASSON—I regret that the hon. member desires to push the thing further than it has been pushed. I do not see what is the responsibility of the Minister. He has the ordinary responsibility of a Minister of the Crown and on that responsibility we can judge him and we can vote want of confidence against him if we choose to do so; but he has not insulted a single member of this House; he has not even supported the man who, we thought, had insulted the House, since he came to the conclusion himself that there was no insult in the matter complained of. We can have our opinion of the Minister of Justice and we can express that opinion by a vote against the report of that Minister or any other Minister, but to exact that he should write an apology to this House when he has committed no crime, is further than this House is prepared to go.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The other day, in order to shorten the discussion on this matter, I failed to express my views, and I do not want to do so now. When my hon. friend opposite (Mr. McInnes) showed me Mr. Moylan's report I expressed to him the same opinion with regard to it as the leader of the House did—that it certainly did not apply to him, and I think, after the avowal of the Inspector himself, and after the language used by the hon. gentleman from British Columbia in this House under the privilege he has in Parliament, stigmatizing the Inspector's conduct in the way he did, and, after the excuse the Inspector has made, saying that he never intended to reflect upon the hon. Senator, and had no reference to him at all, I think this matter has gone far enough. I believe that if the vote of the House had been taken on the question when it was first before the House instead of being unanimous in the matter, a contrary vote would have been recorded.