

every year, but that cannot be done even in this world, and I believe that it cannot be done in the next. People will talk, and people will remember and bring these things home to the offenders. The canal officials and Superintendent should have thought of that. If they had kept that in mind they would have acted differently at the investigation. The commissioner, in speaking about the aqueduct, says there is no evidence to show the canal officials erred in its management; that if they erred at all they erred on the right side. If it is on the right side to drive business away from the Welland Canal and send it through the Erie Canal, the commissioner gives himself away, and he could not have read the evidence before Mr. Rykert brought this question up, or he would not have given himself away as he did. He may want to hedge now if it is not too late. Then, on the gas question, what does he say? "I think it has been so thoroughly investigated, so far as the effect on the canal itself is concerned, the supply of lights and its management, that there can be no possible question to my mind that there is anything to complain of." What do you think of such evidence, and the commissioner who expresses such an opinion? What is his object? Is he acting in the interest of the people of this country? I should say not. Is he acting in the interest of the canal officials? I do not say that he is; I do not say that they paid him one dollar, but they did pay \$1,675 to Mr. Rykert to defend them from this old man. The commissioner, with regard to the borrowing of this money, said (see page 1426): "I could fancy such a story as this coming to the ears of Senator McCallum, and I must confess that it created an unfavorable impression in my own mind, as I did not know where it would end;" but mark, hon. gentlemen, he ended this question when he would not allow me to examine Booth, Bradley, Smith and others. Anybody may read the evidence for himself. The commissioner is responsible to the people—if they will take the trouble to read the evidence. I will now give a list of his rulings against me. He rules against me, and allows evidence to be taken about the practice on the canal as to teaming, although he formerly ruled that Mr. McCallum should not be allowed to show that former superintendents on the canal did not get free gas. He did

this because he wanted to protect Mr. Ellis. Any one can see how the commissioner, by his rulings, tries to cover Mr. Ellis' conduct. Then the commissioner ruled, in the case of the witness R. B. Dunn, that he would not allow me to prove how much money Mr. Ellis got as testimonial; that was Mr. Ellis' private affairs, but I venture to say that every dollar Mr. Ellis got cost us \$10. At page 102, Timmons' evidence, the commissioner ruled out the questions: "Did you give other Superintendents free gas?" "Did you give him anything else?" At page 109: "Do you make it a practice to give every person free gas who is civil and courteous?" Ruled out. At page 123, statement of the gas furnished free, pages 1458 and 1459, the commissioner refuses to allow me to prove a letter that is in the record sent by Mr. Ellis to Mr. McDonagh to be copied by him and sent to Sir Charles Tupper (see page 346). That is the letter in John McDonagh's evidence, that notorious letter written by Mr. Ellis in praise of himself, to be sent to Sir Charles Tupper, as if it came from Mr. McDonagh. At page 1499 in John Bradley's evidence the Commissioner ruled out the question whether witness had contributed any money towards the payment of Mr. Ellis' debts. The question following, by the commissioner, made the witness the judge whether the bargain was corrupt or not. He ruled out the question: "Did you ever tell anybody that you advanced a sum of money that way?" At page 1502, in Richard A. Booth's evidence, he ruled out the question: "Did you give any portion of your horse hire at any time as a loan to Mr. Smith or Mr. Ellis to pay Ellis' debts?" At page 1857, in John B. Smith's evidence, this question was ruled out: "Did you borrow any money from anybody else just in that way to pay debts? Did you borrow some from John Bradley?" The commissioner asked if it was money for any corrupt purpose? In reply I said that he, the commissioner, should be the judge whether it was corrupt or not, that we did not want to make the witness the judge. The commissioner said that Mr. Smith might answer the question if he liked, but he would not insist upon it. Mr. Rykert advised the witness not to answer it. That is a sample of the rulings of the commissioner on the canal investigation. I made up my mind that he did not want any