

to him. First, he says, "he wrote a letter to me, which shows that it was to me he was looking and not to other people. He did write a letter to my hon. friend, and if any hon. gentleman has the report before him, I would like him to look at it. At the foot of page 25, Mr. Moylan speaks of the persons who circulated these fly sheets, and of certain credulous individuals who had laid charges on those statements, which charges, he said, were made in a dastardly manner. I have already shown that no one could characterize the charges that Senator McInnes made as being made in a dastardly manner. They were made in an open manner in his position as a member of this House, and there was nothing that he said that could be distorted into anything dastardly.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—There is one question I would like to ask the hon. gentleman: has the Inspector, during the whole of the investigation, ever asked about the charges that were made except the ones in the British Columbia newspaper? Is not every question that is asked for the purpose of fastening it on me?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend really astonishes me. That is the 3rd point that my hon. friend raised; what he says now, and what he said before, astonished me, and I think it will astonish this House when it learns the facts. To return to this letter, the Inspector, after dealing with the paragraph which I have just referred to, proceeds in another paragraph to turn to my hon. friend, and obviously refers to a different subject. He says: "In connection with the remarks made by senator McInnes on the 24th April last in the Senate, I addressed, with the approval of the Minister, the following letter to that person." He says here "to that person;" "I think it was wrong and indecorous to speak of Senator McInnes in that way, and Mr. Moylan has been already told so, but still it is not an offence so heinous as to justify what my hon. friend has said. But anyone who will read the report with an unprejudiced eye will see that the Inspector is dealing with two different matters. In the first paragraph he says that persons have made grave charges in a dastardly manner, and then in another paragraph he says that he wrote Senator McInnes a letter. As far as

anyone can judge from the appearance of these paragraphs, Mr. Moylan was speaking of two different things when he characterized these charges as "dastardly" in one paragraph, and in the next paragraph stated that he had written a letter to my hon. friend. He does not speak of Senator McInnes' charges as being dastardly, but in the letter which I have already read to the House, he asks the Senator, in the most polite and respectful manner, to put him in communication with what witnesses he could.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Why did he write that letter at all, knowing that I was not in the country?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend says that he was not in the country at the time; I take his word for it but I do not know whether Mr. Moylan was aware of the fact or not. I must take the report as I find it. My hon. friend says that the Inspector has villified, slandered and abused him in this report. Now, I find that he wrote my hon. friend a most civil and respectful letter, asking him to put him in possession of information. My hon. friend asks "why did he write to me?" He wrote because my hon. friend made certain charges from his place in the Senate. I give him credit for having made them in the mildest manner possible. His motive, and the mode in which he proceeded, are perfectly clear—perfectly right and reasonable as far as I can see. My hon. friend insists that it must have been with regard to him that this enquiry was instituted, because he had made those statements before the *British Columbian* newspaper.

HON. MR. MCINNES—No months after?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Then I did not correctly understand my hon. friend. He says now because he was the second person who made the charges, therefore the enquiry was made. There are no conclusions to be drawn from such statements in one direction or the other. Whether my hon. friend made the statement in April and the *British Columbian* newspaper made them in February, or *vice versa*, does not afford any clue to the desire or intention of Mr. Moylan in instituting this investigation; there is nothing to indicate anything unpleasant to my hon. friend in that. The hon. gentleman said, and