

unwisely advised the Government with respect to the bridging of Red River," an accusation which I will refer to presently. The Commission have dropped all the other charges, but they have raised new issues. There is scarcely one of the first 177 pages of their Report, which does not refer to me. A reader of the Report of the Commission, without a knowledge of the facts, could come only to one conclusion, viz: that three successive Administrations had employed a man to conduct the heaviest works ever undertaken by Canada, whose one aim and object was to do everything the way in which it should not be done.

It would take almost as many pages as the Commission have written, to meet in detail all the accusations they have made and the censures which they convey. The task would moreover be most distasteful, as in exonerating myself, I would in many instances be compelled to place blame on others. Those with whom I have been long associated, will attest that I have ever sought to avoid such a course; indeed, I have often borne blame and responsibility which should have been shared by others. I propose to depart as little as I possibly can from my usual practice, in the explanation and defence which I now submit, and I shall refer only to the most serious accusations with which I am specially arraigned by the Commission.

1. It is charged that I incurred unjustifiable expense in prosecuting the preliminary surveys, and that I should have conducted operations in some other way.

2. I am charged with neglect of duty with regard to what is known as the "Muskeg Question."

3. The charge is renewed that I unwisely advised the Government with respect to the bridging of Red River at Selkirk.

4. I am charged with ordering an unnecessary survey from Gardner Inlet to Lake Francois, in British Columbia, resulting in waste of time and money.

5. I am charged with recommending the purchase of 50,000 tons of steel rails in 1874, without any defined view as to the times at which they would be wanted.

I propose to take up these charges *seriatim*. Before doing so, I desire to refer to documentary evidence which the Commission have suppressed.

#### DOCUMENTS.

(A) Sandberg's diagram, showing the average price of iron and steel rails for 20 years, ending with 1874.

(B) Letter to the Secretary of Department of Secretary of Railways and Canals, in reference to certain evidence given by Mr. Horetzky, dated 22nd June, 1881.

(C) Order in Council in reference to saving in cost of construction of Sections 41 and 42, dated 18th June, 1880.

(D) Letter to the Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to saving to be effected in construction of sections 41 and 42, dated 14th June, 1880.

(E) Letter to W. T. Jennings, Engineer in charge of Section 42, in reference to saving in cost of sections 41 and 42, dated July 16th, 1879.

(F) Unofficial letter to Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, Minister of Public Works, enclosing memorandum on the construction of the Pacific Railway, and with reference to personal charges, dated 30th September, 1874.

(G) Memorandum in reference to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and settlement of the North-West Territory, dated 29th September, 1874.

Copies of these seven documents are appended. They were sent under cover, on the 14th January last, to the Secretary of the Commission, with the request that they would be taken as part of my evidence. That they were received there can be no doubt, as the one marked G. is printed with the Report of the Commission. The remaining six have not been published, and, with one exception, have not even been noticed.

*Document A.*—This document is important in connection with charge No. 5 above. The Commission have published a document, at page 170, purporting to have been put in evidence by me, but it is not a copy of document A, and conveys quite a different impression.