

"In reply, would say that I regret that you would not allow what I wished to point out to you that I considered had been proven in the canal investigation to go in the record with the evidence.

"You offered by your letter of the 13th to take the arguments and put them in type-writing, as you said, for my benefit and Mr. Ellis; but you did not offer to report it along with the evidence. I, Sir, had no benefit to receive from any course that you might pursue only with the rest of the public.

"The reasons given by you for your actions in the matter in your letter of the 14th I do not consider of any value, particularly the matter of costs.

"You say that you understood that the arguments were to be for your benefit. What right have you to think that what I had given months time to prove in behalf of the public was only to be addressed to you, and for you to treat it as wind afterwards if you thought proper to do so.

"I wanted it for the public, and you refused to have it go with the evidence.

"2nd. You say that I stated to you that my argument would be very short. That is not a good reason, if it was a question of expense, as you say, for it would cost less to put in with the evidence.

"It would have taken me probably two hours or more to point out to you what the evidence shows to have been proven, and I consider that would be a very short time to give to the matter.

"I did not go there to give wind. At the time that I told you that it would not take me long to point out to you what was proven by the evidence I also told you that I would consider it my duty to comment on your ruling.

"Whether that had anything to do with your sudden change to not have the argument reported and put with the evidence or not you know best.

"The first intimation of the change to not have the arguments go with the record was from your letter dated at Madoc, 11th November, which I received at St. Catharines on the morning of the 13th, in which you stated that for reasons that you would explain to me when you would see me? Did you tell me? Yes; you told me after we had had some words about the argument. Then you gave as a reason that it would cost one hundred dollars; you further said that such expenses should be paid by the litigants and not by the Government. You must have forgotten that I was there in behalf of the public, who were paying the expense.

"Then I left you when you showed so much feeling, if not bad temper, as I did not consider I was a litigant, and would do the same again under similar circumstances.

"You also stated in your letter of the 11th from Madoc that you had not heard from Mr. Page. I requested you to send for Mr. Page two or three times, and you told me that you had done so. I have Mr. Page's letter, dated 5th November, stating that you did not send for him and that he was not coming as a matter of choice.

"Your letter to me of the 11th wants an explanation, at least with reference to Mr. Page not being recalled. He did not make his appearance, and he gives the reason why.

"I say to you in all candor that I know that the evidence proves, and further, when you ruled against evidence such as Booth's, Smith's, Bradley's, and when you gave Mr. Abbey a lecture about his evidence, which I spoke to you about privately at the time, that it would have the effect of keeping witnesses from coming to testify.

"I can remember the evidence given without giving it much further consideration; it, and the difficulties I have had to contend with to get it are impressed on my memory strongly.

"I will not now, at the eleventh hour, send you any memorandum that I have taken of evidence, as

I would wish to comment on and explain them. You refused to take them once, except on your own conditions; therefore, you could not have considered them of much value, and I refuse to give them to you, except on the conditions then proposed, that my argument and what I would point out to you should go with the evidence to the public.

"You say, enclosing your letter of the 14th, that you are conscious of having endeavored to discharge your duty without favor to any.

"That, Sir, the public will be better able to judge after we see your report, and after that your sayings, rulings, and doings on the Welland Canal investigation will become common property, and until that time arrives I have no desire to discuss the question farther, unless public interest demands me to do so.

"I am, respectfully yours,

"L. McCALLUM."

Then follows this letter from the commissioner.—

"MADOC, 29th Nov., 1889.

"Hon. L. McCallum, Senator :

"DEAR SIR,—When in St. Catharines this week I found a registered letter for me, from you, bearing date 18th November. I received it on the 27th; I suppose it being registered was the reason why it was not forwarded. There are two matters in your letter that appear to need a reply—one a seeming misapprehension of what I meant when I proposed to have your argument 'put in type-writing,' which was that it would not be forwarded with the evidence. I intended it should be forwarded with the evidence and report, and now state, in order to meet your wishes, that if you will furnish me with your argument in manuscript containing whatever you may consider desirable as to my ruling, etc., I will have it put in type-writing and forwarded as a part of the investigation proceedings, to the Department at Ottawa, along with the evidence and my report, and in order to give you plenty of time to furnish it, I will carry out the above proposal if your manuscript is received by me any time before the 15th December next. I trust this will be satisfactory.

"The other matter is your reference to Mr. Page's attendance. I had written him, but receiving no answer as to his coming, and thinking my request was not definite, I wrote him a direct letter on the 7th November, with reference to your requiring him again before the investigation closed, and named Tuesday or Wednesday, the 12th and 13th November, as desirable days on which to take his evidence, and asked for a reply by telegram. I did not receive a reply before the afternoon of the 11th November. Herewith is a copy of my telegram then received, an extract from letter referred to received by me on the 13th at St. Catharines. They speak for themselves.

"It is the source of much satisfaction to me to know that in this investigation the evidence, ruling and argument on the ruling from time to time was taken *verbatim* by a stenographer.

"I have the honor to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. F. WOOD."

I will now read a copy of a letter from Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of Canals:—

"OTTAWA, 11th November, 1889.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 7th inst. was received on Saturday last, requesting me to appear before the Canal Commission again to answer certain questions appertaining to canal management. In reference to this matter it may be stated that when before the commission on Wednesday, the 16th of October, I stated it would be well that all the questions intended to be put to me should be asked there, as it