

the public to judge between the Commissioner's report and my statements. I said last year in this House that the Government of the country had increased Demare's salary by \$300, on the recommendation of Mr. Ellis. The Commissioner reports that this officer has extra duties to perform which entitled him to the increased salary. I know that that money has been paid from that day to this, and paid illegally, as there is no Order in Council to sanction it. If there is, I never could find it. I wrote to the Auditor General to ascertain if there was, and he could not find any Order in Council to sanction it. By reading the report carefully, the effort of the Commissioner to cover up that \$300, and to show that this officer was deserving of it, is plainly seen. He tries to cover it up by describing in detail the duties Demare had to perform, the tools, implements and stores used on the canal that he has charge of, to see that they are in readiness for any and every purpose during the season of navigation through the line of the Canal. I question very much if the Commissioner saw the tools that he describes if he would know what half of them were for. He says that the evidence taken against Mossip to destroy his character is very much hearsay evidence. So it was. The Commissioner allowed anybody on the other side to give hearsay evidence, but he would not allow me to put in evidence of that kind to prove his good character. The Commissioner reports that Demare had much to do with the band hall; that he ought to know all about it, and he saw no reason to doubt Demare's testimony. I disagree with him altogether on that. I say that he must be wilfully blind, or that he did not read the evidence, or he would have made no such report that "he had no reason to doubt Demare's testimony." I referred on a previous occasion to the gas question. The Commissioner says: "I have watched the evidence taken in reference to this question, and I find that not in one single case has the public service suffered by the gas being turned down." I think I said before that Mr. Ellis is a good looking man, but I do not think the Gas Company of St. Catharines would give him free gas and free fuel merely because of his attractive appearance. They are not the men to do it, and even Mr. Merritt admits that he consulted with

him about turning down the gas on the Welland Canal, though the Commissioner says nothing about that, and every thing is said to favor him in the report. The Commissioner could not have read the evidence of Captain Hume, Edward Armstrong, Adam Kennedy and others, and the evidence in connection with the drowning of Clark and Miss Kennedy. If he did, I take it that he was shielding illicit conduct in reference to this gas question to cover up a corrupt act. The Commissioner reports that Mr. Ellis knew nothing about the arrangement with Abbey for borrowing money to pay his debts until some time after. The evidence shows that this arrangement went on for eight months, and that Ellis knew all about it a month or so after the arrangement was made. The Commissioner simply says that it was not a satisfactory arrangement; but the Commissioner, in questioning J. B. Smith, who made the arrangement, said if he could have dealt in this way with Abbey, what was there to hinder him from dealing with a hundred others of the employes in the same way? I say if he could, what control could he have over those men after he was in their power, having borrowed money from them to pay his debts? The evidence of Smith is that he told Mr. Ellis about the arrangement, and what did Ellis say to him? He simply asked him to keep it quiet and not say anything about it that might make it public. There was a charge that Roger Miller used Government material and labor which he did not pay for. The Commissioner gets over this by reporting that the suspicion arose in mixing construction and repair work. It makes very little difference to the Government of this country whether we pay two or three hundred dollars more on repairs or construction, as far as the people are concerned, so long as they get the work for it; but here is a man having a contract with the Government for building this pontoon, for which he was paid \$3,200, and the men in the employ of the Government, as shown by the evidence, worked on this pontoon and were paid by the Government. How could the Commissioner get mixed on this question of construction and repair if it was not to cover up a job? That is the way the Commissioner takes to get over it, but he cannot get over it with me, for I was there and saw for myself. Speaking of the leases of