

returned, bearing the mark "Passed by the Military Censor," and also the word "Prohibited." Mr. Seabrook and his friends seem to have seen something very sinister in that. It has to be remembered that this paper was being prevented from coming into the country, for the reason given, in 1914. The explanation is simple. Before America came into the war it is probable that much of the correspondence for America contained information of interest to the Germans, and the attention of the Censor was directed towards this correspondence. It is probable that this letter addressed to the publishers in America was submitted to the Censor, who probably opened it, and stamped it "Passed by the Military Censor." Mr. Ostler suggests that because the words "Passed by" are covered by the words "Military Censor" the letter was not passed at all; but the mere fact that the words "Military Censor" appear on it is sufficient to indicate that it was passed by the Censor. Allusion has been made to the fact that it also bore the word "Prohibited." The only explanation of that is the explanation given by the authorities—that is, that the letter was held up and the endorsement stamped on it under a misapprehension. An assurance was given, too, that the two officers responsible for holding up the letter were not Roman Catholics. That should have been sufficient to satisfy every reasonable person, although I do not think Mr. Seabrook is satisfied. It is more than probable that some officer in the Post Office, knowing that this paper had been formerly on the "Index Expurgatorius" of the Post Office—the list of papers that were prohibited—had forgotten that the ban had been removed, and so put on the word "Prohibited." It is quite evident that the occurrence was due to a misapprehension, and that there was nothing sinister about it at all. Since then the paper has continued to pass through the post, and Mr. Seabrook, by this time, is no doubt enjoying the comforts of *The Menace* in exchange for his subscription. That disposes of the charges of improper interference with letters. I do not think I should outline the evidence I propose to call. I will certainly prove that in no case has there been anything to justify these charges. Never in the history of the Post Office, never in the history of the Dominion, have more fantastic charges been made against a public institution, and based upon more frivolous evidence, than Mr. Elliott has brought forward. The inquiry has already shown, first, that the censorship was not established in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church; secondly—and this will be confirmed—that no breach of duty or violation of his obligation on the part of any Post Office official has been proved or can be suggested, except on the part of some unknown individual whose identity Mr. Elliott refuses to disclose, and who apparently has not thought it wrong to violate his promise of fidelity and secrecy in order to communicate some fact to Mr. Elliott relating to the internal working of the Post Office. Mr. Elliott referred to a statement in the order-book, but he has refused to give any evidence whatever which will enable this individual to be identified and properly dealt with by his Department. I say that with that exception—and Mr. Elliott has not thought it beneath his dignity corruptly to use him in formulating his charges—with that exception there can be no suggestion of any single breach of duty on the part of any Post Office official. The result of Mr. Elliott's tampering with a Postal official, and his refusal to supply your Worship with the information necessary to identify him, is that all the officers of the Post Office may be connected in the public mind with this alleged dereliction of duty, and all are placed equally under a stigma and reproach. And what is the result? In view of what has happened there will be a feeling of suspicion in the Post Office of one officer against another because there is one traitor who has not thought it beneath him to consort with the enemy. On behalf of those officers I say that they keenly feel these charges that have been made against them. They keenly feel Mr. Elliott's neglect or refusal to supply the information which would enable a proper investigation to be made. That they have been unable to supply the Chief Postmaster with that information necessary to proper inquiry being made in the prompt manner characteristic of the Post Office is due to no fault on the part of these officers. Though I have no right to speculate as to your Worship's findings, I have no hesitation in saying that the result of this inquiry will be to re-establish in the minds of right-thinking and reasonable people that confidence in the Post Office and its officials which has hitherto always been enjoyed, and has been the pride of the men in the service. From the category of reasonable persons I except, of course, Mr. Elliott and Mr. Seabrook, because I feel certain that no proof, however cogent, will ever satisfy those gentlemen and convince them against their preconceived notions and prejudices.

WILLIAM RUSSELL MORRIS examined.

1. *Mr. Gray.*] What is your full name?—William Russell Morris.
2. You are Secretary to the Post and Telegraph Department?—Yes.
3. How long have you occupied your present position?—For five years, since 1912.
4. Before that you occupied several high positions in the service?—I have been in the Postal service for forty-two years.
5. And in that time you have necessarily served under many Postmasters-General. I desire to ask you whether, in dealing with applications for Postal service, or applications for preferment for promotion, a man's religion is taken into account?—Decidedly not.
6. Have you ever known any instance where a man's religious belief was inquired into by the Postmaster-General or any other officer connected with the man's duty?—No.
7. In making application for Postal service is a man required to state his religious belief?—No.
8. Do you know whether in any branch of the Civil Service there is any such condition?—I am not able to speak positively about other branches of the Service, but I believe I am correct in stating that in no branch of the Civil Service is a man required to state his religious beliefs when making an application for service.
9. Are you a Roman Catholic?—No.