

more evidence on this point of borrowing money from the employés on the canal to pay Mr. Ellis' debts by such private arrangements as those made with Mr. Abbey. He lectured Mr. Smith on misconduct, and I take it from his remarks that their actions in that matter alone ought to be enough to relieve Mr. Ellis and Mr. Smith from performing any further duties for the Government, and should lead to their dismissal from the public service.

At page 1867 the commissioner says: "I can readily understand such a story as I have heard coming to the ears of Mr. McCallum, and I confess that it created an unfavorable impression on me, for I did not know where it would end." The commissioner ended it, as you will see by his ruling, by not allowing me to examine witnesses on the matter.

The hon. member for Lincoln tried to belittle my efforts on behalf of the public in this investigation. He says the amount taken from the public is only \$118. He admits a misappropriation to that extent. It reminds me of the excuse of the poor girl who had met with a misfortune, for which she was rebuked by her mistress. "It is true," she said, "but after all it is only a very little one." But in this case, when we come to dress up Mr. Ellis' bantling, we find it to be as follows:—

MEMO.

Mr. Ellis takes to his own use, as proven approximately, Chatfield's services for 3 weeks, as proven by Chatfield's evidence, at \$75 per month	\$ 55 00
Services of Hartley, acting as man servant for over half of the time, for over 4½ yrs.	1,000 00
Chas. Hill, teaming, as per Morey's evidence	60 00
Chas. Hill, as per his own evidence	16 00
Chas. Hellenus, carpenter, 8 days, \$2 a day.	16 00
Hamilton Page, hauling iron fence.....	1 00
John Sexton, 2 days at \$2 a day.....	4 00
William Hopgood.....	2 25
Martin MacCormack	1 00
Thomas Bonwell, 20 days.....	30 00
George Nickolson, carpenter, 18 days.....	36 00
Detention of scow "Mud Hen," and crew, while taking baggage to station.....	4 00
Monies certified to by himself, say, horse-hire to Foster, the same being paid by the Government—put it at the low figure of \$100 a year, making.....	800 00
Free gas, and using it for fuel for 4 years, at \$150 a year.....	600 00
Testimonial for his good looks and civility.	600 00
Money collected from Smiley and Dickson for use of pontoon and not accounted for,	38 00
Total.....	<u>\$3,263 25</u>

This is approximately what Mr. Ellis received as his share of the plunder, as

shown by the evidence; and I am satisfied that the evidence shows but little of the wrong-doings on the Welland Canal.

This \$3,263.25 is the sum that he has had for his own use, without saying anything about what others got. Mr. Rykert says I got annoyed at the *Mail* because they said so-and-so about me. It is true that I showed the *Mail* up; I did not show all that they got, because I did not have an opportunity of doing so: but let us see what the *Mail* did say. They did not want this inquiry to go on; they wanted to throw cold water on my efforts, and said:

"The Welland Canal investigation will cost the country fully ten thousand dollars. Its origin was a series of charges made by Senator McCallum on the floor of the Upper House against the canal Superintendent. When the commission opened its proceedings in St. Catharines, Senator McCallum was invited to establish his charges. He essayed to do so, but without success. Thereupon the scope of the commission was enlarged."

That is false; it was never enlarged, but this was intended to throw cold water on me:

"Instead of being an enquiry into the specific charges, it developed into a fishing expedition. The only persons who profit by the enquiry are the commissioner, the official reporter, and Mr. Rykert.

"No public good has as yet been derived from the investigation, and if, as is probable, Mr. McCallum puts his best foot forward at the early stages of the proceedings, it is apparent that no advantage will be scored in the near future. This observation must be accompanied by the saving clause that the public interests may have been served indirectly by the testimony Messrs. McCallum and Rykert have given touching their own characters as statesmen. Mr. McCallum, during the fits of candor which are produced by his frequent animated controversies with the other side on the subject of the reception of testimony, is wont to fall into an audible contemplation of Mr. Rykert's political record, while Mr. Rykert, in retaliation, gives descriptive accounts of Mr. McCallum calculated to reduce that gentleman, though one of our local peers, to the level of an ordinary Grit."

I would say on behalf of the commissioner that he did not hold back. The *Mail's* article would create the impression that he was profiting by the length of the investigation. I will take the blame of its length. I was there alone, without assistance, and had to examine all the pay-lists for the last ten years. I will say, in justice to the commissioner, that however he may have acted since the 13th November, up to that time he occasioned no delay. Mr. Rykert had two adjournments, which I did not want. I had to come thirty-six miles every Monday morning to attend the investigation. I do not want the commissioner to be answerable for my sins; he