

those persons who are stated in this report, to have been guilty of dastardly conduct with regard to the penitentiary. The abstract proposition of Mr. Moylan is not attached to my hon. friend when he says "He is a veritable coward that makes accusations against men who, by reason of their position, are helpless to defend themselves." It seems to me, from the casual examination I have made of this report, that the persons who have really made these charges are, I should judge, the publishers of a newspaper in New Westminster. I find here in the report a letter from Mr. Moylan to the publishers of the *Daily Columbian*, in which he says:—

GENTLEMEN,—My attention has been called to an article published in the "*Daily British Columbian*" on the 8th of February last, on prison reform, in which the following passage occurs:—

"If half the stories that are told about our own provincial institution are true, an investigation is urgently demanded."

I am further informed that, in another issue of your journal, the general statement made by Senator McInnes, last Session, in the Senate, as to the existence of abuses and irregularities in this penitentiary was endorsed.

In view of these publications I have the honor to state that, during my present visit to this institution, I should be glad to make any enquiries that might be called for by the facts which have come to your knowledge, and to which you have made reference, in your paper.

If you will, therefore, be good enough either to furnish the evidence yourselves, or to give me the names of any persons who may be able to prove the existence of abuses or irregularities, a careful investigation shall be made and I shall be glad if you can be present thereat.

I do not find anything disrespectful in that to Senator McInnes. It is plain in this report that Mr. Moylan put his finger on the men who are publishing charges against him, and that these are the men that he calls on to verify them, and asks to be present when he goes into an investigation to ascertain what ground there is for making such charges.

HON. MR. MCINNIS—Will the gentleman please read the letter that he addressed to me?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Yes, here is the letter:—

"SIR,—In view of the statement made by you in the Senate, last Session of Parliament, to the effect that abuses and irregularities exist in this penitentiary, I have the honor to state that, during my present visit to the institution, I shall be glad to make any inquiries that may be called for by the facts which have come to your knowledge and to which you made reference in the Senate.

"If you will, therefore, be good enough either to furnish the evidence yourself, or to give me the names

of any persons who may be able to prove the existence of abuses, or irregularities, a careful investigation will be made, and I shall be glad if you can be present."

What on earth does my hon. friend find objectionable in that? Here are two sets of people, as appears by this report, who made charges against this penitentiary. My hon. friend, in his place, stated he was informed that great irregularities and abuses existed, or something to that effect. The Inspector writes him a perfectly respectful letter asking him to be good enough to furnish him with the names of the persons who could prove those charges, or to give him any assistance he can in the investigation. Where is there anything wrong in that? Then he writes to the other parties who had spoken in much stronger language than my hon. friend, and respectfully asks them to give him any information they can. The man was doing his duty. He saw by the Senate Debates and by the newspapers, that reports were current that the penitentiary was not properly managed. He wrote to the people who had spoken of these reports and asked them for all the information they could give him, informing them that he was going to make a thorough investigation. Some of these people, as will be seen in a moment, refused point blank to have anything to do with the investigation, or to give any information, and reiterated their charges in an insulting manner. My hon. friend did not do that. The publishers of this paper wrote and communicated to him, as I understand, the article they had published in their paper. It was very strong indeed, and they insisted on a special commission being appointed outside of the service. Then they quoted the speech of my hon. friend and proceeded to say:—

"The foregoing extracts will explain our attitude on the question of an investigation into provincial penitentiary matters more clearly perhaps than anything else, and it will not be necessary to give any further reasons for respectfully declining to shoulder the *onus probandi* in such an investigation as you propose. We might add that any evidence in an investigation into the matters in question should be taken on oath."

These gentlemen, then reiterated their charges in a much more definite and a much grosser form than Senator McInnes had used respecting them in the House, and I cannot see how my hon. friend takes to himself the abstract remark that a man who slanders his neighbor behind his back is a coward. My hon. friend did not slan-