

would be very difficult for me to put in another appearance, as my duties are of a nature that they cannot be delayed without great loss and inconvenience to the public.

"JOHN PAGE."

Then, follows this telegram, which the commissioner must have had that morning, though he did not say anything to me about it.

"FROM OTTAWA, ONT., 11th Nov., 1889.

"To A. F. Wood, M.P.P. :

"Received your letter requesting my attendance at St. Catharines. I cannot leave here at present without great injury to the public service. Have written you to St. Catharines. Letter may be read in court if thought proper.

"(Signed), JOHN PAGE."

I will now read a brief note that I sent to the commissioner :

"STROMNESS, 5th December, 1889.

"A. F. Wood, Esq., M.P.P., Commissioner, &c., &c. :

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 24th ultimo is at hand to-day ; contents noted.

"In reply, would say that I have nothing further to add to my letter to you of the 18th ultimo.

"I am, Sir, yours truly,

"L. McCALLUM."

I had nothing further to add to what I had already written the commissioner, as I made it a rule in life that if a man deceives me once I wish to have nothing further to do with him, and I came to the conclusion from the action of the commissioner on the morning of the 13th November, when he wanted to suppress from going to the public what I considered was proven at the canal investigation, he was not treating me properly, and that will explain my short replies to him :

"RE WELLAND CANAL INVESTIGATION.

"MADOC, 24th December, 1889.

"Hon. L. McCullum, Senator :

"MY DEAR SIR,—Herewith, per registered letter, I send you the balance of the testimony taken with Mr. Rykert's argument. I waited until the last available moment, hoping you would have forwarded your argument also. Of course, I have not been awaiting for argument to form an opinion, but it would have assisted me to reach conclusions with less labor. It has been no light task to go through the evidence again. You will find my report at Ottawa in the Department of Railways and Canals, when you desire to see it.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. F. WOOD."

I hope that the commissioner has arrived at a correct conclusion. I do not know what it is, but I know what it should be, and I think, hon. gentlemen, that you will agree with me what it should be, after I have explained the evidence taken and the commissioner's ruling as to taking evidence.

The following is the last letter that I will read :—

"STROMNESS, 28th December, 1889.

"A. F. Wood, Esq., M.P.P. :

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 24th instant is at hand, and also the requested document, which you say is the balance of the testimony taken with Mr. Rykert's argument.

"Thanks for the information as to where I will find your report. Will see it soon, after I get to Ottawa, if permitted to do so before given by the public.

"I am, yours truly,

"L. McCALLUM."

As to what the commissioner calls "the balance of testimony," it is not a correct report of what took place on the morning of the 13th November, although I understand it is circulated around among members of Parliament by Mr. Ellis and his friends, with a view no doubt to create a favorable impression on his behalf. It is the usual line of creating popularity by deception. My reason for going into an explanation about this matter is to show you, hon. gentlemen, that I am not to blame if I trespass on your time in connection with that canal investigation. The commissioner divided my charges against canal management into sixteen charges. I did not object strongly at the time, as I did not care how he placed what I stated from my seat in the Senate last Session on canal management. But in coming to a conclusion I wish them considered as a whole, because any one of the alleged charges, if proved, should be enough to cause the dismissal of those found guilty. I will endeavor to point out to you as briefly as I can what I consider has been proved by the evidence, and where to find the evidence taken, the witness' name and page as put in type-writing. I have explained to you, and the correspondence between the commissioner and myself shows why I did not argue the question before the commissioner. I did not think I was treated fairly and I left. I refused afterwards to send the commissioner my arguments in writing, and I think that I acted properly in doing so from the sample of what the commissioner calls the balance of testimony. For some reasons that I do not know, the commissioner wanted to rush matters that morning. He was not to pay any money for anyone's arguments ; that should be paid by litigants. After I left, you can see by Mr. Rykert's speech and the commissioner's remarks that they had a very pleasant time. Anyone reading it can see that there was