

the water power, he says that what the Government was bound to do and what was the duty of the lessees appears to have been very indefinitely defined, and the result has been that the Government has evidently done more than its share. There is evidence to show that the Government has built very important structures for those who hold leases on the Welland Canal, and particularly for the Water Power Company. I have shown that we get \$500 a year from one company and \$150 a year from the other, and that it costs us two or three thousand dollars to keep that work in repair. That is not a good investment for the people of this country. The leases between the Government and the hydraulic company, and other leases along the canal, are kept in the canal office at St. Catharines, and if the Superintendent had examined them he would have found the duties and responsibilities of each party to the lease to be well defined. The Commissioner recommends that there should be a definite decision in this matter without delay, and that there is hardly an excuse for not having done it long ago. I say it is well defined by the leases already, and although the Commissioner rebukes the Superintendent for doing work at these water powers without the authority of Parliament, his object evidently is to cover up the wrong-doings of others, which is quite apparent to any one who examines the leases and reads the evidence. He refers to the charge that Henry Vanderburgh collected a considerable sum monthly for railway hire, amounting annually from \$125 to \$165. He is mistaken as to the amount (he collected from \$165 to \$200), while he travelled upon accommodation tickets costing not over a third of the sum charged. The evidence shows that all he paid was from \$32 to \$36. This is proved by Vanderburgh's own testimony. The Commissioner reports that Ellis should have seen to this and matters of a similar character, and that in not doing so he, as a matter of fact, followed the practice of former superintendents; but Mr. Ellis claims to be a better superintendent than these. No superintendent on the Welland Canal ever followed that practice, and if he did it would be no excuse, because other superintendents got dismissed for wrong-doing; and when Ellis claims to be a better superintendent than the others I am not

going to give my opinion as to how good a superintendent he is. The people can see that for themselves when they have the evidence before them and the report that has been submitted to Parliament. Mr. Wood was a nice gentleman to send to take evidence of wrong-doing on the Welland Canal. He sat at the head of the table, and treated me very gentlemanly all the way through, and very kindly, too, except when he ruled against me, until the last day, and then he thought he was going to run the whole thing—that he was monarch of all he surveyed—but he did not get away with me at that time. The report speaks about the paint that was used not being satisfactory; but see how the Commissioner gets over that. He says: "But the men employed were not skilful painters; they were paid sufficient wages, but did not get a satisfactory result." I have told hon. gentleman what a beautiful paint it was. It was proved by witnesses that it was sticky enough to catch flies with, and the lock-tenders when they went near it stuck fast to it, and had finally to cover it up with canvas. The men employed to do the work were Doig and Johnson, members of the Port Dalhousie band, and the job of painting was given them by Demare, who was president of the band. Members of the band must be employed to paint, even though they were botch painters. The Commissioner says: "I have seen the list of subscriptions to the testimonial, which was between six and seven hundred dollars; and he adds: "I ruled out evidence in this case, as I consider it a private matter." There is no doubt the Commissioner ruled out evidence, as it was shown that the subscribers received a *quid pro quo*. In reporting about Shiner's Pond bridge the Commissioner says: "The position of Mr. Ellis in the matter was very uncomfortable. Mr. Page, in his evidence, reported against it, as Mr. Ellis had no instructions in the matter from the Department. The cost of the bridge was \$1,000." Ellis hid the building of this bridge from the Government, though the Government was pressing him to give explanations of the extra expenditure of money on the canal and elsewhere. Is that the kind of a man to be kept in the employment of the Government on the Welland Canal? He built the bridge against the report of the engineer. The