

ment on the Commission of one Roman Catholic was wrong, or that a better appointment than that of Mr. O'Sullivan could have been made. Must every suggestion of a Roman Catholic be rejected, whether it is reasonable or unreasonable? That is not my view of a public man's duty. If the complaining parties had been Protestants, and the Warden a Catholic, would my fellow-Protestants have thought it reasonable or just that the Commission should go to two Catholics, and that the suggestion to add a Protestant should be rejected? He would be an odd sort of Protestant who would say so or think so. All the story about the protesting of the priesthood is imagination or invention. I had no word on the subject from or with any priest or Roman Catholic, except the Archbishop; and none with the Archbishop beyond what I have mentioned; and the whole matter was conducted by myself personally, until I brought it before Council as stated. The other Commissioners appointed were Judge Sinclair, of Hamilton, a member of the Church of England, and Mr. Langmuir, of Toronto, an expert in prison management, and a Presbyterian.

THE HOSTILE ATTITUDE OF THE "MAIL."

After the prorogation, and before the Commissioners began their labours, the *Mail* newspaper and other journals affected impatience at the delay in commencing, and hinted that the Government was delaying the investigation in Mr. Massie's interest. A few extracts may here be useful:

"The troubles in the Central Prison, growing out of a belief among the Roman Catholic prisoners that Mr. Massie treats them with undue severity, still continue. The withdrawal of Rev. Father Jeffcot, the spiritual adviser of these prisoners, has naturally enough made matters worse. . . . The priest's resignation certainly lends colour to the stories told by the prisoners, but that is all. Mr. Jeffcot made no charge against Mr. Massie, nor, so far as we know, has His Grace Archbishop Lynch. It is pretty clear that one or both of them would have promptly demanded an investigation had there been any occasion for it."—(*Mail*, 13th March, 1885.)

"We have already referred on several occasions to the delay in beginning the investigation into the management of the Central Prison, which was ordered last session. Charges have been made that the delay was intended to allow a large number of prisoners to be discharged and dispersed, so that their evidence could not be obtained against the management.

"We publish this morning at some risk and acting under a sense of public duty, a letter from one of the promoters of the investigation. This letter is of such a character, so startling and shocking if true, so libellous and scandalous if false, that the Local Government dare not delay another twenty-