

With respect to the first part of that letter, I may say that I had a nephew in the position of steward in the British Columbia penitentiary for 12 or 14 years. During the investigation held last year, under a royal commission appointed by the Federal Government to investigate the irregularities in that institution, not one fact came out which would connect him with any wrongdoing in that institution. I have not seen the report of the commissioner, Mr. Justice Drake, since it was brought down in the other House, but I am aware that there was nothing in the evidence to show that he was in any way whatever connected with anything dishonourable or discreditable to himself or to anybody belonging to him. It is true that the accountant was discharged at the same time that the warden and deputy warden were discharged in October last, but my nephew was not discharged. He continued to perform his duties as steward of that institution until October last, when, of his own free will and accord, he resigned the position and went to live in the United States. To say that he was a refugee in the United States is an unqualified falsehood, and I am forced to state that this man Moylan, when he wrote those words, knew that he was writing that which was not true. With respect to the accountant, whose character Mr. Moylan wishes to impeach, I may say that he has occupied the position of alderman in the city of New Westminster for a great many years and is a man who is respected generally in that place. His bare word, as well as that of my nephew and of nearly every person who gave evidence on that occasion, would be taken in preference to the sworn statement of Fitzsimons, or the late Inspector of Penitentiaries either. I do not intend to analyse that report. I shall wait until all the papers are before the House, when every member of the Senate will be in a position to see for himself that I was right when a number of years ago I called attention to grave irregularities in the penitentiary. The investigation proved a great deal more than I even insinuated on that occasion, but I want to call the attention of the House to this fact that ever since I made those statements on the floor of the Senate this man Moylan has on every occasion that presented itself insulted not only me but other members of this House, and that too under the authority of the Government in his annual report.

I would call the attention of the hon. Premier to the fact that there was no necessity whatever for Mr. Moylan, the late inspector, to announce the fact in his report that this Thomas A. McInnes was a nephew of mine. I am not ashamed of that nephew, but I would ask, in all fairness, am I to be held responsible for the actions of a nephew, or even of a much nearer relative? Would any hon. gentlemen here be held responsible for the actions of their friends, however near and dear they may be to them, so long as those friends are not under their control or influence and are of the full age of responsibility? This was a gratuitous insult, not only to me individually, but to every member occupying a seat in this House.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I would ask my hon. friend and the House whether, on a question of privilege, the hon. gentleman can make a speech reflecting upon the character of a gentleman of intelligence and integrity, who is well known in the community and to the public at large? I do not think he can do this simply on a letter found in a newspaper.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—The point is, whether when a writer in a newspaper, or the newspaper itself, calls a senator's nephew a fugitive from justice, the senator can claim the right, as a question of privilege, to defend his nephew, and attack the newspaper writer. He certainly cannot.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—Before a decision is given on the point that has been raised, I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and also of the hon. gentleman who has raised this question of order, to the fact that on two different occasions, to my personal knowledge, a question has been brought up in precisely the same way as I have brought this up. When the hon. gentleman from Delanau dière was attacked, by this imputent fellow Moylan, I brought it up myself, and it was discussed here for some two or three hours—the whole of one afternoon—by more than a dozen hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—If the hon. gentleman himself were attacked he would have a right to defend himself if it came under the class of privilege, but we have no right to