

Superintendent and his family. It was no doubt an innocent violation, though a usurpation of the warden's authority as to what quarters this man was to occupy and how he was to be employed. But in the face of the assurance contained in the letter that "I feel you would not run any risk" in violating these regulations and the oath of office, now and at the instance of this same Superintendent the Minister holds as a most grave offence, that Warden Cooper violated the regulations in the case of this prisoner. The circumstance was that, coming from a journey one night and finding one of his children very ill, under suspicion of having diphtheria or some other infectious disease, and there being only a part-time doctor on the regular staff of the institution, who being ill had left his practice in the hands of his partner, the warden made no attempt to get this very busy man from town, but remembering Dr. Blank, and the permission from the Superintendent to exercise discretion in forgetting regulations with respect to him, had brought this doctor into his house, which is in the penitentiary grounds, to examine the child. The doctor gave him a reassuring report and went back to his cell, and nothing happened. I am told that in the Minister's mind that is one of the serious crimes the warden has committed, and for which he has been punished by losing eight years of his life and by being thrown out of the service as if he was a malefactor of some kind.

You will say he got his gratuity. He got \$1,400; but he had paid into the retiring fund over \$2,000, which, in two years would have given him a permanent superannuation of \$800 a year. By his sudden removal he was deprived of that, and was compelled to sell at auction for \$300, which was all he could get, his household furniture which was worth close to \$2,000. He was led to serve eight years in the penitentiary service, which fits him for no other employment, and he was thrown out without a trial, or a statement of what he had done to deserve such treatment, and was refused access to the Minister or the Deputy Minister.

I said at the beginning that I would leave it to the judgment of those who heard my story whether or not the connection of the Ministry of Justice with this affair warranted the suggestion that they were accessories after the fact. I have a little to add in that connection.

I am permitted to refer here to answers given in another place to questions put on this subject. I am aware of the strict rule against referring to debates in another House, but I took the trouble to look up the rules, and I say on my responsibility that the regulations

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR.

of the House of Commons directly lay down that one may refer to the printed proceedings of another House, although he must not controvert statements made in debate. This is my warrant for referring to these answers, although I do not need to refer to the other House, because the answers have been printed in the public press and I think I am privileged to read them. I read these answers to show that—a member of Parliament having sought to inquire into this matter, and having framed a number of questions which he thought would bring out the material facts—nearly every one of the 17 answers given in the other House after a long delay, and therefore after mature consideration, involves direct misrepresentation either by assertion or by omission. The Minister not being in this House, I call to the attention of his colleagues in the Government, that an official of a Department has been permitted to put into the hands of his Minister, for delivery to Parliament, a series of statements which in my opinion are wholly untrue. This is a very grave statement that I am making; I thoroughly realize the gravity of it.

I have referred to some of those points. First of all, he says: "Colonel Cooper was not dismissed." That is repeated six times. Colonel Cooper was "retired" in a sense, but in the whole history of the penitentiaries there is no other instance of a high officer contemptuously thrown out, as this man has been thrown out. If this does not constitute dismissal, I do not know how else you could justify the term dismissal. Technically, to bring him under the gratuity Act, he is retired; really, he is dismissed. He has not even had a letter following the telegram telling him to get out, and the Deputy Warden watched him get out. He was dismissed. However, that is a play upon words.

Another question was this:

Was an investigation conducted by Inspector Jackson?

Answer:

Yes. Into matters of administration generally.

My information is that there was no investigation into matters of administration generally; that no questions were asked of any witness except questions designed to provoke answers derogatory to Warden Cooper; that there was no attempt to go into administration generally.

The sixth question is:

Had there previously been difference between said Jackson and said Cooper, and were they on unfriendly terms?