

not admissible. All the authorities of Parliament agree upon this point, that the best evidence must be produced; and, therefore, I say, with the greatest deference and friendliness towards my hon. friend, that he is putting the patience of this House to a severe test. It is impossible to come to a conclusion upon what he is laying before them. His efforts should be directed, in the first place, towards having the evidence and the reports brought down, and then we will be in a position to look at them, and form a judgment on the matter. I submit that he should bring his observations to a close until that has been done. I do not say this to obstruct my hon. friend in any way, but as a suggestion in the interest of his own case, and in all friendliness and with due deference to him.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—I have no case. It is the case of the public. If my hon. friend had been in his place in the House when I spoke on this question before he would have known that the evidence is before the House.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—The evidence is not here.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—I am in the hands of the House. I could have put myself in order at any time, but I put it off from time to time. My hon. friend, who comes in occasionally, says I ought to do so-and-so, but if he had been here and heard what I said he would not have raised the question.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—The evidence is not before the House.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—It is here.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—That is a copy of the evidence.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—Yes.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—That is no evidence.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—There is the evidence taken by the official stenographer at the investigation; five copies were made. One copy is with the commissioner, one with Mr. Ellis, one with Mr. Rykert, the Government has another, and I have one copy here. Is not that official evidence?

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—I insist that this report should be before the House.

Several Hon. MEMBERS—Go on; go on.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—Mr. Smith took Abbey aside and made a private arrangement. Of course, Mr. Rykert says in his pamphlet, which is in the hands of every member of this House, that Ellis did not know anything about it. He says this, no doubt, for the purpose of trying to prejudice the case and to preserve the popularity of the officials of the Welland Canal. Well, Mr. Abbey says he got most of his pay back, but he swears distinctly that he would rather work his horse for \$1.25 a day than get \$1.50 on these conditions. Why? Because when he gave this money monthly he received nothing to show that he was giving it. If anything had happened J. B. Smith he would have lost the whole thing, because he had nothing to show what payments he had made. We find that they paid him \$75 in the second year. There are others who were in the same position as Abbey. The commissioner himself, in speaking of this matter and lecturing Smith afterwards, practically admits that there might be others. He said: "If you could make this arrangement with Abbey, what was there to hinder you from making the same arrangement with forty others?" I told the commissioner there were others. I did not say there were forty, though he said there was nothing to prevent it; but he prevented me from showing who the others were by his ruling. Why did he gag me when I wanted to bring out the truth? I desire particularly to bring this to the notice of the Government. On page 2 of the pamphlet he thought he was clear, but he gave himself away. It is stated on page 2 of the pamphlet "Balance of the Testimony." I said the other day that this was not correct. The commissioner says: "The decision was reached after I left here. I wrote you immediately, Mr. McCallum; I got your letter of yesterday." I did say that I got the letter that morning. Here is what he states: "I wrote you yesterday informing you (the commissioner) of the fact that the Government gave me to understand that the summing up is a matter for my personal benefit." I want to know if the Government told him that—if the Government told him to put the gag on me; that I should not