

a kind of mutual admiration expressed between the defendant's counsel, Mr. Rykert, M.P., and the commissioner. You can see further that for the want of argument Mr. Rykert was paying a great deal of attention to the humble individual that is now addressing you—that is to say, no doubt on the usual line, if he could not say anything good of his clients he would make up the time in abusing those opposed to him. Evidently, he, Mr. Rykert, Q. C., M.P., was displeased in the way that I conducted the case in behalf of the public. He, Mr. Rykert, as you will see, tells the commissioner what I should have done and what I should not have done. But I was not there to please Mr. Rykert, Q. C., M.P. I did know from the first that I would have his opposition—that he, Mr. Rykert, was satisfied as to how matters were conducted on the canal. In fact, I have a letter in my hand and a copy of same in the Government's hands, stating that money was paid to a party by the Government for work that was not performed and that it was brought to Mr. Rykert's notice. But Mr. Rykert's reply was that he was no informer; so from that I took it that Mr. Rykert was satisfied with the canal management. But at the same time I was not then and I am not now prepared to accept his dictation as to what I should do or should not do in the canal investigation in behalf of the public. The commissioner, as you will see, at page 1866, when Mr. Ellis is giving evidence on this question, tells Mr. Ellis that the truth is the best. But he, the commissioner, prevented me from getting the truth by his ruling against me. He was looking for the truth as to the making of arrangements with the employés on the canal to pay Mr. Ellis' debts. Did he want to find it? You, hon. gentlemen, can be the judges of that. I would call your attention to his lecture to Alex. Abbey, his rulings on John Bradley's and R. A. Booth's evidence and his lecture to J. B. Smith, in which the commissioner says that (page 861) if he, Smith, could make such an arrangement with Mr. Abbey to get money that he might operate in a like manner with forty others. But by his ruling he prevented me from showing the others that were operated on in the same way as Mr. Abbey. So much for the commissioner's action in bringing to light the doings on the Welland Canal. No doubt

you have heard of tramps looking for work and praying to God that they would not find it. Was the commissioner in this position—looking for money to pay Ellis' debts from the canal employés, and putting the glass to the blind eye, so to speak, like the celebrated Admiral Nelson. When you read the evidence you will be the best judges as to what was done in the way of borrowing money to pay Ellis' debts.

I do not want to say anything against the commissioner. He treated me as a gentleman all the way through, except the last morning. He ruled against me, as I thought, unfairly; but for that ruling he is accountable to the public.

You may remember that I made several charges against Mr. Ellis last Session from my place in this House. The commissioner divided my charges into sixteen, and I will try to deal with them as he has divided them. When I get through with these I will come to what I call maladministration on the canal. The following is the memorandum of charges as divided by the commissioner:—

"1st. Large expenditures for fuel, contrasting 1869-70, 1876-77, 1884-85, 1885-86, 1886-87. (See page 3 of *Hansard*, with speech.)

"2nd. Spending a large amount of money without authority from the Department—notably, building dock at Port Colborne: cost \$4,000.

"3rd. That the location of 'dock' made it of no value. (See first column, page 3, *Hansard*, near bottom.)

"4th. Built Custom house and post office at Port Colborne, though the Department of Public Works had charge of construction, at a cost of \$4,400. (See page 3, 2nd column, *Hansard*, near top.)

"5th. Allows employés to work for outside parties, and they are paid by the Government. (See page 3, 2nd column, *Hansard*.)

"6th. Allowed parties to be paid for work not performed. (See page 3, 2nd column, *Hansard*.)

"7th. Allowed the use of Government property without authority and free of charge. (See page 3, 2nd column, *Hansard*, bottom page.)

"8th. Moneys received and not returned at proper time, and some moneys retained and not credited. (See page 4, 1st column, *Hansard*, top page.)

"9th. Charge against J. E. Demare, Assistant Superintendent, causing trouble; questionable management of moneys. (See page 10, 2nd column, *Hansard*, bottom page.)

"10th. That improper influences are brought to bear upon men who suffer by giving information. (See page 11, 1st column, *Hansard*.)

"11th. In reply to Order of the House, did not give correct replies; says he could not. (See page 11, 1st column, *Hansard*.)

"12th. That he is arbitrary in his treatment of the owners of vessels passing this canal—detaining them without good reason. That he fined a tug owner \$20 for the reason that he questioned his (Ellis') management. (See page 11, 2nd column, *Hansard*.)

"13th. Ellis and Demare are charged with having 'friends and pets,' and Demare with being a 'pet of Ellis.' That in order to get work fitness is not required, but it is essential he should 'belong to the