

argue the question. I do not believe it. I have been a supporter of this Government all my life, and I have nothing to hide. I do not believe the Government gave him that instruction, but he did it nevertheless, and why? Because on the Friday before he asked me if I would take much time. I said: "No; not very long." But I told him I would consider it my duty to comment on his rulings, and that is probably what caused this sudden change of front. That is why he would not allow me to comment on the evidence and go with the report, and explains why I am here to justify myself. He says he got an intimation from the Government. Fancy a commissioner appointed with the powers of a Superior Court judge receiving intimations of this character from the Government! Is it true? No; I cannot believe it. If they did give him an intimation of this kind to put the gag on me and hinder me from proving what I wanted to prove in the public interest, I want to know it, because I gave a good deal of time and went to some expense trying to get to the bottom of this case. It is not, as Mr. Rykert says, on account of spleen and spite. I have no spite against anybody. So much for the commissioner and his actions. I shall deal with his rulings, because I said, in addressing you the other day, that he treated me kindly and smoothly, as smoothly as you please, but he ruled against me, and he exceeded his powers in doing so. I maintain there were others who could give evidence of transactions such as that proved by Abbey, but the commissioner thought by not allowing me to bring forward other evidence that he was going to carry the thing by force. He thought that with Rykert, Q.C., M.P., he would overpower me. They thought they would make themselves all right by circulating this pamphlet. I do not know whether my friend from Erie Division has a copy of it. If he has, he certainly would not attack me for defending myself. I am put in a false position, and that is why I bring up the question here. I was willing to wait. I waited eleven months in the matter. I brought it before the Government last year. Did they suspend the Superintendent? No. I have waited three months longer, and if the report of the investigation is not here it is not my fault. On the 13th November this investigation was closed at St. Catharines.

If the report is not here I am not to blame. After the commissioner ruled against me I asked Mr. J. B. Smith the question: "Did you borrow any money from anybody else, in the same manner, to pay debts?" The commissioner did not want him to answer. He wanted to add the word "corruptly." I told him: "You should be the judge in the first instance, the Government next, and then the people." Then he said, when I urged him, that the witness might answer if he liked. I asked the witness to answer but what do we find? We find that the gentleman defending the canal officials advised the witness not to answer, but shortly afterwards the commissioner, when Mr. Ellis came up to give evidence, said to him: "Truth will hurt nobody; truth is always best." He was looking for the truth but he did not want to find it. He put me in mind of the tramp who was looking for work, but hoped to God he would not find any. The commissioner ruled that I should not ask the same question of John Bradley. He would not let me ask Richard A. Booth as to whether he had given any portion of his horse-hire towards the payment of the Superintendent's debts. Here is a one-armed man, working on the canal as a foreman, working one horse and driving another, getting paid \$1.50 a day for each horse and \$2 a day for himself. That is the way business is done on the Welland Canal; but this is a friend of Ellis', and has done him some favor on the Intercolonial, and of course he wished to pay him back with the money of the country. Now, we will give this thing another turn, and talk about rubber boots. This is a strange thing to talk about in the Senate of Canada, but people on the Welland Canal brought 241 pairs of rubber boots into Canada without paying any duty, and sold them to the employés of the canal, and every man who bought a pair of boots had two days' time that he never worked returned to him to pay for them. That is in the evidence. It is true, I will admit, that Mr. Ellis had nothing to do with that. I do not hold him guilty of the rubber boots transaction, but I want to show the character of this man Roger Miller, who was put in the witness box twelve or thirteen times to try and swear Ellis and the rest out. I want to discredit his evidence as to these rubber boots. He swears that Mr. Page told him it was a good plan to return two days' time that the people did not work to pay for the boots.