

them people who are going through the canal are being fined. This a part of the evidence. This man Demare pays money to himself that should have been paid to the credit of the Government; also moneys collected from the barge "Hall." Demare says that he sent \$10 in a letter to R. D. Dunn, but that letter was never received. Why should he send this letter to the paymaster at all? He was not the proper officer to receive the money. The collector of canal tolls was the proper officer to send it to, and the paymaster was not instructed to receive any moneys. If Demare desired to act honestly in the matter, all he had to do was to step across the street to the office of the collector of canal tolls; but he prefers to send the money by letter to the paymaster, and the letter is never received. (See Mr. Dunn's evidence about this \$10, pages 21 and 22 of the evidence). Mr. Dunn swears that Demare was at the canal office every day, but said nothing until the matter was brought up in Parliament. If I had not referred to it, this and many other things would still be going on. I am not saying that they are going on now, but these men are still in power on the canal, and there is no guarantee that they will not begin again. They boast that they are stronger than ever, that they will be more popular than ever: but are the Government going to keep them in power? I say they should not. The Government of this country ought to clean out these men who are mismanaging the canal. They should weed them out, and put honest men in their place, and we will have proper management on the canal. The revenue would then cover the expenditure. The Welland Canal can be managed to-day for \$12,000 less than is the case, and better managed, saying nothing of the pickings (I will not say stealings), and the money wasted besides, which no doubt would be equal to another \$12,000. There is no doubt at all in my mind that this saving could be made. I do not want to cut down the salaries of officers. I want every man to be well paid; I want every man to do a good day's work and to receive for it a good day's pay; to attend to his business properly, and not come to work at ten o'clock. What do we see? There are three or four deputy superintendents who come with their horses to report to their chief. You would think you were at a fair. We are paying Mr. Ellis \$300

a year for his expenses for horse hire, but he does not go to the men: the men come to him and report to him, and each one gets \$150 a year for horse hire, merely for reporting to Mr. Ellis every day. This is the way that business is conducted on the Welland Canal, and the sooner it is stopped the better. Mr. Demare says that he collected from the barge, "Manitowoc" \$12 or \$15. The evidence shows that he collected \$18; that he paid in \$10, and consequently he must have kept the other \$8. These are some of the pickings I spoke about the other day. Take Mr. Smilie's evidence, page 176: this shows that Mr. Demare collected \$18 and paid in \$10 only. Smilie is a truthful witness. He must be so, because the gentleman defending the canal officials did not ask him a single question. He did not think it advisable to do so in their interests. He sent him away because he thought he knew too much. For this reason, I consider that anything Smilie says may be depended upon.

Bradley, of whom I spoke a little while ago, was discharged for refusing to make a false report against a brother lock-keeper. Mr. Demare's reason for discharging him does not appear to be anything else than that he would not make the false report required of him; he would not carry out Demare's request, and of course he must go. If this man Bradley did not give correct evidence why did they not impugn it, and bring evidence to show that he was not telling the truth? They tried to do so, but they found out that any evidence which they could bring would only confirm what Bradley said. His evidence to-day stands unimpeached, except by the statements of Demare himself,—and how much are they worth? Three of his friends swear one thing and he swears another? Can you believe his word, when it conflicts with that of a man whose evidence is unimpeached? Demare was in the witness stand ten or twelve times; his evidence is discredited; I do not believe him; I have given my reasons.

Well, so much for that charge. Now for the 10th charge: "That improper influences are brought to bear upon men, who suffer by giving information." I consider this a somewhat foolish charge. I think that hon. gentlemen can appreciate my feelings when I say that I would not put in the witness box any poor man who had