

making this statement officially, and he replied "Yes, of course, otherwise I should not make it." I reported this to you verbally at the noon closing.

On visiting the Shop this afternoon at 3.10, I was informed by Mr. Chaplin that Mr. Robertson had been in the Paint Shop in the same place for the past three-quarters of an hour. On my entering the Carpenter Shop, Mr. Robertson was coming down the shop towards the entrance.

Instructor Allan gave evidence before Cooper, as reported on page 230, to this effect: "A check-up of stock would require from 20 to 30 minutes. He," meaning Robertson, "should have been on the outside job. I know of no reason why he was not. He had no reason to be in the paint shop; I would not consider he was properly performing his duties if he was there; he had ample duties to keep him outside."

By contrast this is the evidence as taken by Inspector Jackson, who had already said that this whole thing was a frame-up. Perhaps I had better read his report of Trollope's evidence, at page 277:

Q. Did you report Carpenter Instructor Robertson to your Warden on or about November 11th.

A. Yes.

Q. In reporting Instructor Robertson for sitting beside an inmate were you informed so or did you see him.

A. I am reporting him on Mr. Chaplin's report to me, not for sitting beside an inmate, because I only saw him there for a moment.

Q. Did you consider his act of sitting by an inmate, when you saw him, as being contrary to the regulations of the Institution.

A. As I could not see what Mr. Robertson was doing, whether instructing or otherwise when I noticed him there, I cannot say that he was acting contrary to regulations. Had Mr. Chaplin not reported Mr. Robertson's conduct, I should not have made a report on the matter.

Honourable gentlemen can see what a difference it makes how the questions are asked, and how a man who asks leading questions can influence any witness. I suppose during the whole of that investigation the evidence was devilled just as it was in this case by a man who opened every man-trap in the sewage system of the penitentiary for six or seven years and out of the filth presented all the dirty matter he could in an attempt to blacken the character of the Warden, against whom no charges were made.

In his annual report, too, recently submitted, the Superintendent makes most contemptuous and palpably untrue reference to the services of his victim. The man who does this pretended to be the bosom friend of Col. Cooper and his family, whose hospitality he freely accepted and with whom he had been on terms of the greatest intimacy. Similarly

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR.

with the Deputy Warden and his family. Deputy Warden Trollope, like Warden Cooper, had been a worthy officer in Colonel (now General) Hughes' battalion in France, and Trollope had been led to believe that he too would be a warden in the Penitentiary Service. But the two men and their confiding families have been betrayed by this shameless assassin of position and character, who has made of them objects of doubt and suspicion on the part of people who find it hard to believe that a Department of Justice would do so great a wrong. Judas went out and hanged himself.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: What was that quotation from?

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I am sorry to say I have not the page for that, but it is well established. Deputy Warden Trollope faced the finger of scorn of the whole entourage of the penitentiary, bond and free, because he was credited with being the intended beneficiary of the despicable frame-up of Superintendent Hughes and his coconspirators and spies, and, having the instincts of a man and a gallant officer, retired in disgust from a service which had been so degraded. Superintendent Hughes remains, however, to spread deceit, equivocation and insinuation over the records of the Department of Justice (save the mark) and of Parliament.

Superintendent Hughes blatantly proclaims in the annual report of the department that his friend—or shall I more correctly say his accomplice?—Inspector Jackson has accomplished more at the New Westminster penitentiary than Col. Cooper did in ten times the period. Of the kind of accomplishment, yes. Surely he has been making history: the loss of his Deputy Warden; the burning of the Warden's residence, at a cost of perhaps \$25,000, through leaving the place unprotected, in defiance of special instructions, and through negligence in allowing the water service for fire protection to be turned off; the loss of a convict, the first to escape in many years, through disobedience of the regulations forbidding one guard to take more than two convicts for work outside; the ruin of the guard, with seventeen years' service as a soldier and ten years' faultless duty in the penitentiary, through dismissal because of the improper risk imposed upon him; the pinching of the \$900 good conduct money otherwise payable to the guard, and the contemptible slur cast upon this guard by the Superintendent when he pleaded to be allowed to resign and so save his gratuity; the making within the penitentiary of tools with which bars were filed to permit another