

have a lawyer? Defend them—defend them from what? If they had done their work, if they had discharged their duties properly, why did they want any defence at all from me? Did the Government and the country prosecute them—did they send any one to get at the facts? What was the necessity to employ this lawyer—this Q. C., M. P.—to defend them from my attacks? The Government sent nobody to prosecute—took no part in the investigation, although I must do them the justice to say that they sent me all the papers that I wanted; but that is all the assistance they gave me, and I had none from the commissioner, but I had his opposition, as I will show you by his ruling. Mr. Rykert says in his pamphlet:

“From the 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 employes, or his deputy superintendents, or upon any one single thing which would satisfy you that they would act dishonestly or corruptly.”

You can form your own judgment whether the Q. C., M. P., the counsel for the canal officials, is a proper judge of dishonesty and corruption. Does he know what it implies? He says that these charges are “of a stale character, dating back to 1880-81, down to three or four years ago.” The hon. gentleman can judge whether they are of a stale character or not. It may be very desirable for some parties engaged in public as well as in private life to clear their slates once a year if it is possible to do so. But such an operation as rubbing off the slate cannot be done even in this world, no matter what one does to cover up his shortcomings. It is an old saying and a true one that “Chickens come home to roost,” and it was never more exemplified than in this case of the commissioner, the Q. C., M. P., and the canal officials. The Q. C., M. P., says: “I would not wish to say anything that would reflect upon Mr. McCallum or any other person.” Oh, no! Of course that hon. gentleman would not say anything to reflect upon any one, except that he was personally interested, or well paid, as in this case, in which he receives for his services \$1,675. He accuses the humble individual now addressing you of showing venom and spite, but that does not apply to me. I was neither pulling wires nor strings, nor working for money, nor to serve any private interest or gratify any personal feeling, but I am one of the five millions of people in Canada, and a member

of this Senate, and as far as possible my services, humble though they be, were given and are now given in behalf of the country and good government. I have acted the part of a self-constituted public prosecutor without fee or reward, only having the satisfaction to know that I was working in the interest of the country, and not to serve any personal spite, as stated by the Q. C., M. P. The counsel of the canal officials complained that I received some of my information through anonymous letters. I stated before the commission that I had received information that way, and for saying so I was rebuked by the commissioner, as he did not consider such information of any value. But the information that was received in that way was followed up by me, and I can say to you I found it almost invariably correct in every instance. The people that gave me information were no doubt employes of the canal, and were afraid to sign their names to any letters that they sent me, as it might lead to their dismissal—at least, that is the only way I can account for it. You can draw your own inference. The Q. C., M. P., misquotes the evidence taken before the commissioner, as appears by this pamphlet, circulated, as I must say, to create a wrong impression.

The Q. C., M. P., states in his pamphlet that “Mr. Abbey swore that Mr. Ellis knew nothing at all” about getting this money from Abbey to pay his debts. By referring to Mr. Abbey’s evidence you will see that he says nothing of the kind. He swore that J. B. Smith told him that the 50 cents a day was to pay Mr. Ellis’ debts; that was when he (Smith) was making the arrangements with Abbey about hiring his horse. The Q. C., M. P., also states that “Smith swears the same thing.” Mr. J. B. Smith, the broker, does nothing of the kind. He (Smith) swears that he told Mr. Ellis about a month or a month and a-half after he made the arrangement with Abbey how he was raising the money. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Mr. Ellis knew how his broker was raising the money. This pamphlet states that “Mr. Abbey got his money back,” but the true answer of Mr. Abbey was that he got it “mostly back.” The pamphlet also states that “it was an action away back in 1883,” and should never be brought here. As I have said, it is very desirable to clear the slate