

as to what took place after I left; but what took place before I left is recorded and published by the newspapers that had reporters present.

I was willing to wait patiently to see what course the Government would take on the commissioner's report, but the publication of this pamphlet by Mr. Rykert, who was counsel for the officials, and of the officials themselves, has forced my hand, so to speak. This pamphlet has been scattered broadcast over the country, and a threat was made that I was to be sued for libel. For anything that I should say in this Chamber I could plead parliamentary privilege, but I would not have done so had they brought their action, because whatever I stated I had good reason to believe was founded upon facts, and was prepared to prove in a court of law. I will now read the account of what occurred on the last day of the commission, as published by the newspapers. The reporters representing those papers were present from day to day while the investigation was going on, and one, at least, was not very friendly to me. The *Journal* report is as follows:—

“THE CANAL INVESTIGATION.

“SENATOR McCALLUM PICKS UP HIS PAPERS AND LEAVES IN A HUFF.

“Commissioner Wood arrived here this morning, and shortly after 11 a.m. said he was prepared to hear the argument of Senator McCallum and Mr. Rykert. Mr. McCallum found fault with the arrangements where an official reporter was not present to record the statements, and picked up his books and left the room, apparently much annoyed, stating he would have the matter settled by another tribunal. Subsequently the commissioner ascertained that Mr. Ellis had secured a short-hand writer to report Mr. Rykert's speech, and made an arrangement whereby Mr. McCallum's speech would also be reported. This the commissioner was not bound to do; for, as he stated, argument was not statement of facts to be regarded as evidence, and when reported is generally at the expense of litigants.”

Well, I was not a litigant: I had no more interest in the result of that investigation than any other person in the 5,000,000 of people who inhabit this country. I was there on behalf of the people—I was not a litigant, though I was treated as one from the beginning to the end of the investigation. Now we will see what the other paper, the *Star*, says:—

“THE WELAND CANAL CASE.

“SENATOR McCALLUM DECLINES TO PUT IN HIS ARGUMENT—MR. RYKERT'S CONTENTION.

“ST. CATHARINES, 13th November.

“The Ellis Commission met this morning to hear the arguments of Senator McCallum and Mr. Charles

Rykert on the evidence given in support of the charges and the evidence in defence of Mr. Ellis. At the opening of the commission the Senator enquired if the argument was to be reported and printed in the same manner as the evidence had been, to which the commissioner replied that he had decided not to put the Government to the expense of furnishing a printed report of the argument, as it was simply a matter for his own personal benefit, and should not form part of his report. Mr. McCallum then stated that he wanted his argument reported and made public, bade the commissioner good day and left. The commission adjourned for two hours, and the Commissioner sent a letter to Mr. McCallum, stating that he would have the argument reported and a copy furnished him as he desired; but the Senator decided not to put in an appearance. Owing to the fact that Senator McCallum attached so much importance to the reporting of the argument, the commissioner employed a stenographer, who had been engaged by Mr. Ellis to report the argument, after receiving the communication from the commissioner that he did not intend to have the argument reported, but left it for the press. The commissioner expressed regret that the Senator did not avail himself of the opportunity he expressed such a desire to have. Mr. Rykert's argument, which lasted three hours, was logical and convincing. He reviewed the evidence at length, going through all the charges, all of which, he contended, were disproved; and, in conclusion, he submitted to the commissioner that his report to the Government must be that Mr. Ellis' management of the Welland Canal had been honest, efficient and impartial. The commissioner will to-morrow, weather permitting, take a trip over the canal.”

I also remember what was said and what is recorded and put in as balance of testimony must have been got up afterwards from memory to answer a certain purpose, and which has the effect of placing me and my actions in a false position before any one reading what the commissioner is pleased to call the balance of the testimony taken before the commissioner. I think it best at this point to refer to what took place that morning which caused me to leave the commissioner without pointing out what the evidence proved in the investigation. In order to do so it will be necessary to read some correspondence, and you can be the judge of the commissioner's action. In the first place, as to this matter, my understanding with the commissioner was, when I left him on a Friday afternoon, that on the following Tuesday or Wednesday he would hear the arguments at St. Catharines, and Mr. Holland would take them in short-hand and put them in type-writing, and that they would be sent as part of the record, with the evidence, to the Government. But on the morning of the 13th November, the day that the commissioner appointed to hear the arguments, I received a letter from the commissioner dated at Madoc, 11th November, stating that for reasons that he would