

specific. In this contention he was overruled by Doctor Mills. The fact is that Mr. Beall's memorandum dealt with a very sad and very disgraceful state of affairs, and both Doctor Hodgins and Principal Dymond wished to shelve the question without discussion if that were possible. I charge that the complainants were at no time treated as prosecutors, but as mere witnesses, being dismissed from the enquiry room before any other witness was called. The Principal was never absent and was free to question each and every witness as he felt disposed.

Again I repeat that Doctor Chamberlain, Inspector of prisons and charities, was associated with the commissioners originally appointed, a fact in itself amply sufficient to frustrate the purpose of the enquiry, for the Principal and the Inspector hold absolute sway in the Institution. There is no appeal from their decision. For this reason I unhesitatingly charge that the staff was lashed into line by threats of dismissal from the service. This charge can be proved before any non-partizan tribunal, and I court the opportunity to prove it. Officials entreated the complainants not to call them as witnesses, and within twenty-four hours two members of the staff, the two we firmly believed to be the leaders of their colleagues and the friends of the blind, completely changed their front. Read the following official statement of their evidence. Place it against the documentary evidence that follows. Bear in mind these witnesses were not under oath, and that half a score of witnesses could have been called in refutation had the complainants been allowed to call them, and then say if you can what brought about the change, if intimidation did not.

Why does this evidence not state who called Thomas Truss? Why was the author of the Ratcliffe pamphlet not given an opportunity to defend himself on the spot? What show of

justice was there in the emphatic refusal of the commissioners to read Truss's evidence to him and to hear his statement then and there, or in the brutal sneer of Doctor Chamberlain that he had not proved his charges? Facts are facts; study them.

T. W. McLean, Literary Teacher.  
(called by Mr. Beall.)

Q. What do you know of the treatment of the teachers by the Principal?

A. I have felt that sometimes we have been dealt with severely, and sometimes leniently. My opinion has changed constantly. On the whole, I have thought that we have not been treated as fairly as I would desire. Our experience did not seem to count for much, in consultation in regard to management.

The Principal:—Have you known me to do anything towards you that you would call bullying or terrorizing; or have you seen me so treat other teachers?

A. I don't think that you have ever bullied me. If speaking sharply means bullying, I have been spoken to in that way sometimes. I really do not want to give any evidence; I would rather not give any evidence.

Q. You know whether the Principal's treatment is unduly harsh?

A. I don't think I have ever received harsh treatment. I have always felt under restraint to a certain extent. For example, one morning I was called out of the class-room to the water-closet. The Principal came and asked why I was out of the class-room. I resented it very much, and felt indignant about it.

Q. Was it the manner or the action?

A. Both. Another time I was in the Bursar's office, in the morning, waiting for a cheque. Mr. Dymond came in and asked why I was there, and called my attention to the fact