

of the fact that the
it is a matter for my
the responsibility of
at a cost of \$100, it is

matter. You have got
I wanted, in justice to
it should be there, and
go a step further. You

ment

You say I can go on.
permission. I want to
rewriting, so that you

mission. I expected to

telling him I will have
commencing at 2 o'clock.

ator McCallum, stating
his argument reported
t, an expert, who was
of Mr. Ellis, and that
argument. I may state
lines to proceed with
matter, and declines to

to avail myself, before
information I may consider
for any information I
re to you, so that you
shall probably supply
that Mr. McCallum
the fact that my only
matter of economy and
had no idea that Mr.
ough the typewriting
remarks he wishes to

n, who has seen fit to
se of this Commission
Canal, should have at

the last minute declined the offer which you made him to have his argument reported in full. He has no right, I think, to complain of your treatment of him during the progress of this inquiry, because if any person in a court house, or in an official inquiry, was ever allowed a latitude by any person, he certainly was by you. Instead of treating him improperly, I can only say for Mr. Ellis, and I think I can say truthfully, that you have conducted this inquiry with that judgment and that ability which I think the country had a right to expect from you. From your long experience in public matters and your experience as a business man, I am satisfied the Government could not have made any better selection. As far as I am concerned, I am glad to bear testimony to the fact that this inquiry has been conducted with judgment and with moderation, and a determination to arrive at the bottom of the whole matter, to sift it from beginning to end, and in such a manner as well warranted the government in appointing you. I say it is due to you to make those observations, because I consider that, in a long investigation, which involved no less than the trial of about 150 odd charges of one kind and another, it required a good deal of judgment and a good deal of tact upon the part of the gentleman conducting the investigation, as to how, and in what manner, the evidence should be received. So far as Mr. Ellis is concerned, and so far as I am personally concerned, I am happy to bear testimony to your great ability and your great judgment, and your exceedingly great patience in listening to this investigation, and to the taking of the evidence throughout the whole inquiry. I think it is due to you to make these remarks, particularly after what I consider to be the very offensive manner in which my old friend, Senator McCallum, has laid the charge to you that he had not been fairly treated. It is not open to him, at any rate, to make the charge. So far as we are concerned, Mr. Ellis says he has been fairly treated, and treated with the utmost consideration by you, and, whatever your judgment may be upon this inquiry, Mr. Ellis will be perfectly satisfied you will give it according to the dictates of your own conscience.

Now, sir, what I understood to be the object of this inquiry was to investigate into the management of this canal. It is for you to inquire—and those were the instructions of the Government to you—whether the management was good or whether it was bad, and, if bad, whether Mr. Ellis was to blame for it; and, if any abuses existed, how and in what manner the abuses could be best corrected. That I consider to be the scope of your inquiry. I did not consider it your duty—nor did I believe the Government considered it your duty—to extend your inquiry into investigating matters of petty grievances that different persons, former employees of the canal, or present employees of the canal, might have against Mr. Ellis or his deputy superintendents. I considered your duty was one of a larger scope, investigating a matter of a public character, looking into the management of a great public work, the greatest, probably, in this country, of a public character, excepting the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was your duty, I conceived—and I have no doubt you looked upon it in that light—to enquire whether or not any abuses did exist; and, if so, how those could be remedied; and to make such suggestions, as to the future management of the canal, as your judgment might dictate. Now, that is the way that I looked at this enquiry. From the very commencement I had no idea that Mr. McCallum could lay his finger upon a single act of maladministration upon the part of Mr. Ellis, or his employees, or his deputy superintendents, or upon any one single thing which would satisfy you that they had acted dishonestly or