

The answer is:

There were no personal differences. They were not on unfriendly terms.

My information, to the contrary, is that it was common knowledge both in Ottawa and in New Westminster that these two gentlemen were on unfriendly terms, and I have this statement, delivered to me as a statement of fact:

Jackson's personal hostility to Cooper was well-known to members of the staff. This hostility flared out openly in the discussion as to Cooper's report on the motor car in May, 1926. The following inspection, Hughes and Jackson spent an entire morning endeavouring to browbeat Cooper into withdrawing this report, threatening that the Minister would dismiss Cooper were the report forwarded to him, as the cars were purchased on the Minister's express orders. So bitter was Jackson that during this discussion he challenged Cooper to personal combat.

Yet, with the knowledge of this relationship, to the question asked in Parliament, "Was there hostility between the investigator and the warden," the answer put into the hands of the Minister is that there was no hostility between them.

Then the question is asked:

Did said Inspector Jackson refuse to permit said Cooper to be present during the taking of any evidence (except his own) and also refuse to permit said Cooper to examine or cross-examine any of the witnesses or to be informed of the nature of their evidence?

The answer is:

Yes. The investigation was held in connection with general administration and not on charges against said Cooper.

Yet the letter of the investigator directed to Cooper at New Westminster said: "This investigation is on charges made by you and into general administration."

Colonel Cooper was refused permission to examine or cross-examine witnesses. He was informed of and questioned regarding any evidence taken that affected himself or his administration.

Cooper says he was not informed; that he was simply asked questions indicating the subjects upon which his inquisitor had received certain information. That surely is not the honest answer that should be given to Parliament on questions of this kind.

It is stated in the answers:

Inspector Jackson did not recommend the dismissal of Colonel Cooper. He recommended his retirement immediately, to promote efficiency and harmony in the Penitentiary Service, because of maladministration.

I say that absolutely no maladministration was ever shown or ever charged, and that Cooper is entitled to have communicated to him this report of Jackson which appears to

have established to the satisfaction of the Minister the particulars of the maladministration alleged.

I think it is true that Cooper was the most efficient warden in the whole Penitentiaries Service. When, a little while ago, I mentioned his record of promotion from one institution to another, I forgot to put in this incident, that in 1925, two years after he came to British Columbia, he was invited by letter from Superintendent Hughes to consent to a transfer to St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, because of Hughes' representation to him that the St. Vincent de Paul institution was in a bad way and that a strong and efficient man like Cooper was required to put it in order. It will be familiar to honourable gentlemen from Quebec that St. Vincent de Paul was without a warden, or deputy warden either, for nearly two years. My information is that in 1925 Cooper was asked to accept that most responsible position, because of his high character and reputation as an efficient warden.

Now, I think I have said sufficient to indicate the untrue nature of these answers to the questions asked. I will not further labour the matter, but will simply make the request indicated in the notice, that, the Minister of Justice having, as I see it, been misinformed grossly as to all the circumstances of this case, he should now have an inquiry, either by a judge or by some other independent authority, into all the circumstances connected with the removal of Warden Cooper. I am conscious of the fact that every year for several years past there have been scores if not hundreds of inquiries into supposed delinquencies on the part of employees of the Government—humble individuals like postmasters. If it is worth while for the Government to appoint a Commission to find out whether or not a postmaster has supported the local member, surely it is worth while to have an inquiry when the character and the livelihood of a good official, as Cooper proved himself to be, is at stake; when he is slandered under the authority of the Minister of Justice, as he has been slandered by the presentation of those answers to Parliament; when he comes forward and says: "All those statements are a slander on me, they are not founded on fact, and I challenge investigation of them."

Before the sham inquiry was held, seeing what was coming, Warden Cooper asked permission to come to Ottawa and interview the Minister and tell his story. He got no response whatever to that request, and by the regulations he is forbidden to communi-