

Commissioner reports "this charge is sustained, but is qualified." Now, see the qualification:

"Former superintendents did not give an account of the moneys until the end of the year."

That is the qualification, but the former superintendent of the Welland Canal was sacked for his conduct, and although Superintendent Ellis has been guilty of more transgressions than all the former superintendents put together, he has not yet been dismissed. I charged Mr. Ellis with having kept some of the public money for a year and ten months, and that fact is proved by the evidence and report. What did he do with it? Why should a Government official collect public money, and keep it in his possession a year and ten months, when he should have handed it over promptly to the Government? Still, we are told by the report that his integrity has been sustained. Sir John Macdonald is a lawyer, which your humble servant is not; but I know all about this evidence, and I can read, and I can judge a little between what is wrong and what is right, and with all due deference to our right hon. leader, I disagree with him entirely, and every man in this country who is not biased in his opinion will disagree with him also on this matter, when the evidence is made public.

Now, as to the question of management of moneys and Demare giving more trouble on the canal than any other man, we will see how he slides over this charge. Last year I put in a list of certain moneys that the Superintendent had collected, and the Commissioner reports: "If this be a fact, it is not sustained by any of the evidence." I say that it is sustained by the evidence. I give the report a flat contradiction. The Commissioner says Mr. Neelin, M.P.P., gives Mr. Ellis a very high character. Well, if he does, that character is not based on evidence taken before the Commissioner.

The Commissioner reports: "Demare says he mailed ten dollars in the post office in the presence of Roger Miller." Demare did not say anything of the kind; he did not say that Miller saw him put it in the post office; but he said he saw him put it in an envelope. But why should he send it to the post office at all, when all he had to do was to step one hundred yards and pay it in to the proper office? The Commissioner says: "I see there is no reason to doubt Demare's

statement in regard to the letter, as it has undoubtedly gone astray in the mails." But what about the ten dollars he paid himself out of the sum collected from the schooner "Leighton" and the eight dollars from the barge "Manitowac?" This ten dollars has never been explained, and the other ten dollars, the Commissioner says, was lost in the mails. I do not know what authority the Commissioner has for saying that. My hon. friend from Belleville said the other day that the Commissioner was once a postmaster himself, and perhaps he can understand it. The Commissioner makes no reference to the ten dollars and the eight dollars collected from those vessels I have mentioned. Every word that I said here in this House I believe to be true, and I have not over-stated the case at all. If a man goes in the witness box and swears to one thing, and three witnesses swear to the reverse, would you believe that man's evidence? The Commissioner knows that these items were not accounted for, and when he tries to palm this man off on the country as an honest man, I say it is too transparent altogether. Then, what about farming out the Government land on shares and swearing that he received no portion of the crops? We have the evidence of McGraw, Moriarity and Brownlee, who swear positively that they all gave him a portion of their crops, grown on the Government land. This is the man that the Commissioner says Mr. Page gives a good character of. Mr. Page says that he is skilful and energetic—no doubt, skilful and energetic in his own interests, but not in the interests of the public, as the evidence shows, when he farmed out the Government land on shares, and then swore that he got nothing for it. Then, with reference to the trouble at the aqueduct the Commissioner reports that Captain Saurin was entirely in the wrong, that clearly the charge was not sustained, and that the officials were trying to do their duty. I contend that this charge is clearly sustained by the evidence of Charles Carter, harbormaster; of Captain Saurin, of Captain Ross, of Robert Simpson, of Sperry Carter and others, and in spite of all this proof the Commissioner has the audacity to say that the charge was not sustained. All I ask is that the evidence taken before the Commission be published in full, and allow