

land Canal. I do not mean to accuse Mr. Ellis or the gas company of being the cause of the unfortunate drowning accident by which a young man and a young woman lost their lives; but it is a question for you to consider, when I get through, whether they did not contribute, to a certain extent, to the death of those two people. A young man named Clark and a young lady named Miss Kennedy left St. Catharines on the evening of the 18th of August, 1885, for a drive along the bank of the canal. They had a perfect right to expect to find the gas burning. The canal bank is a road used by the public. At each gate, wherever a bridge crosses the canal, every bridge-tender has a key, and he locks the gate if the road is not open to the public. When Mr. Clark and Miss Kennedy drove along the canal bank they had a right to expect that the gas would be burning full flare, because they knew the country was paying for it. The evidence goes to show that the gas was turned down at the time the drowning accident occurred. I took the evidence of Mr. Donald McPhee, an expert, and it goes to show that where Mr. Clark and the young lady were drowned, if the gas had been turned full flare a hole in the sidewalk could have been seen. No inquest was held. I do not like to say that the influence of the gas company prevented an inquest, but Edward Goodman, who is the coroner, and who is also a director in the gas company, was on the spot after the accident. However, no inquest was held. I remember the lock-tender gave evidence on this question; he was the only person during the whole of the investigation to whom I said an unkind word. He could not tell me, though he was within a few hundred feet of where Mr. Clark was drowned, and was the lock-tender at that lock, whether the gas was burning that night or not; and I said to him: "You are a know-nothing." The evidence of Mr. Goodman, the coroner, will be found on pages 1531 to 1537. He says that the gas company gave Mr. Ellis free gas and \$100 towards his testimonial because they thought he was worthy of it. Joseph D. Carroll, the old gentleman that tried to prove that Mr. Demare pays for the gas in his house, says that he has nothing to do with the gas metres—that his son does that business. He says further, at page 93, that he has nothing to do with the accounts. I

remember, at the time I asked him the name of his son, and he said Joseph, and I said: "We have got the wrong Joseph." But this old gentleman is recalled for the defence, and his evidence will be found at page 2325. He says he took the record of the meter at Mr. Demare's house and found that he had used 25 or 30 cents worth of gas. When first called he knew nothing at all about this—said that his son attended to the matter; but when he comes to give his evidence later on he knows all about it. I think it will be found that Mr. Demare gets his gas free, because the Government pays for it. Mr. Carroll says that he never rendered Mr. Demare an account. Why should he render him an account? Mr. Demare takes his gas after it goes through the Government metre, and he has burnt it for three years in his house, using five jets, as can be seen from Mr. C. Demare's evidence. Mr. Carroll further remarks that he never rendered an account to Mr. Demare although Mr. Demare had asked for it. It is very strange and very improbable evidence. There was a witness named Vanderburg, a very important individual, who gave evidence at the investigation. He is the gentleman who, when first called, knew nothing about the band hall—had only seen it in passing by it; but when re-called remembered that he had a mortgage on the property. This man's evidence, as you will see by reading it, at page 490, was most unsatisfactory as to the management of repairs and works on the Welland Canal, the manner in which the time is kept and also his charges for travelling expenses. He charges as high as \$205.90 in one year for railway fares. The first time he was called he swore that he paid full fare, but I got out of him when he was re-called that he only paid between \$32 and \$36. I refer you to his evidence, pages 1548 to 1559. You will also observe that his mode of keeping time was very unsatisfactory: he mixed red and black marks, writing one over the other—the red marks were in mourning, at times. There ought to be a different system of time-keeping. Now, it is strange that Mr. Ellis would certify to this man's account when he must have known, or ought to have known, that he had not been paying any such sum for railway fares; but it is easily explained if you will look over the pay-lists. You can see, almost invariably, that whenever Mr.