"would be investigated on the Monday evening following; the investigation did "take place before Messrs. Hopkirk, Corbett, Baker, and Gildersleeve, Inspec-"tors, and the Warden; Mr. Costen, and Guard Bannister, and Somerville, gave "evidence that they found the wicket open; witness swears positively that he "locked the gate carefully, and tried it; thinks thas it was opened afterwards, "and left so by some one; there was an inner gate which prevented persons "getting into the Prison although they had passed the wicket. The Inspectors "decided that witness was guilty, but that in consideration of his previous good "character, as testified to by the Warden, he was forgiven for that time. "four or five days after this decision, witness was again brought before the "Inspectors, on a charge of having a stove-pipe stone in the North-west Watch-"tower without leave, and for the purpose of stealing it. Witness declares that "the charge is utterly false; the said stone had been brought to the Tower by "himself and Guard Fitzgerald with a small stove and some old pipe, to keep "them warm when on duty during the previous winter, nearly a year before the "charge was preferred; and the whole of these articles had lain in the Tower "during the whole summer of 1847 and must have been seen by the Warden, as "he was often in the Tower while they lay there. Witness brought several "witnesses to prove that they had seen the stone laying in the Tower for months " before the charge was brought. Before the Inspectors had decided on the case, "witness became so indignant at the treatment he had received, that he lost his "temper, and told the Inspectors that he had no confidence in any decision they "might give; that Mr. Hopkirk used the Penitentiary as a convenience; that "he often got presents from the Warden; that articles were sent him from the "Penitentiary stores, and a Guard kept almost for his and the Warden's personal Witness likewise said that he knew the rest of the Inspectors to be "the mere tools of the Warden. The Inspectors finally found witness innocent of "the charge made against him by the Warden, as to the stove-pipe stone, but "dismissed him for gross insolence to the Inspectors."

Ques. 663. Was Robinson after his said discharge examined as a witness by the Commissioners against the Warden?—Ans. He was examined as a witness as I mentioned with relation to all the witnesses who were examined by the Commissioners, into the conduct, management and discipline of the Penitentiary.

Ques. 564. Was not his evidence condemnatory of the Warden?—Ans. His

evidence was so.

Ques 665. Was he not subsequently restored by you and your brother Inspectors?—Ans. I have already mentioned, that several officers, amongst whom he was one, whom the Commissioners considered to have been improperly dismissed, was reinstated.

Ques. 666. Was he not a second time dismissed for misconduct, and is he not now himself a convict in the Penitentiary?—Ans. I really have no knowledge or recollection of his having been secondly dismissed; and I believe I have seen in some of the public journals that he was so, and that he committed some act of dishonesty for which he was tried and found guilty, but whether he is now in the Penitentiary I do not know.

Ques 667. In answer to question 614, you state that the report was avowedly a summary: what do you mean by the word summary?—Ans. The report was a full, impartial and accurate statement, in which was condensed, into as clear a form as possible, the whole of the information obtained by the Commissioners on

the various subjects there reverted to.

Ques. 668. Are not extracts in general, given of the evidence under the several charges in the very words of the witnesses, and do they not generally profess to be extracts?—Ans. There are numerous extracts in the report, and they are generally marked as such.

The Committee adjourned until 10 o'clock A. M. to-morrow.