

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, your Committee proceeded to perform the duty assigned to them, and beg to submit the following Report:

That the following extract from a communication addressed to your Committee by T. J. O'NEILL, Esq. represents the charges made against the Superintendent in the first instance—viz., "on the 22nd December, Rev. Mr. MALONY, in company with Rev. Mr. MALBOS, was violently assaulted, as far as the use of language could do it, for having taken the liberty of going down to the public rooms of the females, without having obtained the Superintendent's permission.

"This offence was committed openly, and in presence of all the inmates of that apartment, and such language used as would imply that it was in the power of the Superintendent to tolerate the presence of Mr. MALONY or not."

Your Committee, after a long and careful investigation, are of opinion that this charge has not been sustained. Two members of the Committee do not concur in this opinion, but they consider that no evidence produced has justified the implication conveyed by the words "violently assaulted," in the above extract.

Another extract from the communication above referred to states the charge made against the Superintendent in the second instance—viz. "a repetition of this gross misconduct took place on the occasion of the Grand Jury visiting the House. On Mr. MALONY's asking if he had permission to go down and see the Catholic inmates, the Superintendent replied, in a very offensive manner, 'he had not time then to attend to him, and wished he would retire,' or words as nearly as possible similar."

Your Committee are of opinion that this charge has not been sustained; and, as it appears that Mr. MALONY only imperfectly caught the Superintendent's words, your Committee therefore regret that any charge should have been brought forward against the Superintendent upon such slender grounds.

The next subject investigated by your Committee was the charge made against your Superintendent for having on two occasions (in November and December last) refused admission to the nuns of the order of St. Joseph, and for having kept them waiting an unreasonable time on the outside of the gate.

It is the opinion of your Committee that the Sisters of St. Joseph were not treated with that courtesy which your